

The AMERICAN JOURNAL of ECONOMICS *and* SOCIOLOGY

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the Robert Schalkenbach
Foundation in the interest of constructive synthesis in the social sciences.

VOL. 6

JANUARY, 1947

No. 2

Essays in Honor of Francis Neilson, Litt.D., On the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday

Editor's Foreword	136
Portrait of Francis Neilson— <i>Fabian Bachrach</i>	Frontispiece
Preface— <i>B. W. Huebsch</i>	137
Crusader for Justice: A Tabloid Biography of Francis Neilson— <i>Will Lissner</i>	139
Henry George and Karl Marx, A Plutarchian Experiment— <i>John Haynes Holmes</i>	159
Free Trade With Canada— <i>Oswald Garrison Villard</i>	169
Evaluating the Potsdam Plan— <i>Ferdinand A. Hermens</i>	181
The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, A Modern Plan for Medical Care— <i>Albert Pleydell</i>	195
The Philosophy of Individual Development— <i>Geoffrey W. Esty</i>	205
Problems and Prospects in Hittite Studies— <i>John Garstang</i>	221
Taxation and Redress in Early Yemen— <i>Sidney Smith</i>	231
Education for the Good Life—on the Farm— <i>George F. Hellick</i>	241
American Newspapers Through Two World Wars— <i>Neil MacNeil</i> ...	245
Pope Pius XII, Apostle of World Peace— <i>Donald A. MacLean</i>	261
Democracy in the American Tradition— <i>T. Swann Harding</i>	279
Liberalism and Individual Liberty— <i>Asbley Mitchell</i>	295
Francis Neilson, An Appreciation— <i>John Hervey</i>	303
A Bibliography of Francis Neilson, 1893–1946— <i>Phyllis Evans</i>	309
Contributors	321

Editor's Foreword

THE SCHOLARS who join together in producing this volume in honor of our collaborator, Dr. Francis Neilson, include a majority who have been lifelong friends of his, and a minority of younger scholars—one fifth of the writers—whom he knows only through their work. Each of the boards of this JOURNAL is represented by only a single member, in order to make space available to those outside our circle.

It was not possible to extend invitations to contribute to all the scholars who might otherwise be entitled to such invitations; our space is limited and our interests restricted to the social sciences and allied disciplines. We have tried to obtain studies which would reflect Dr. Neilson's varied interests. In the group there are several notable omissions. For example, nothing could be done in the field of music. Also, several investigations undertaken for this volume could not be included in it, either because they were not concluded in time or because space was not available. These will be published, with appropriate reference, in an early number.

Nearly a third of the contributors are English scholars, which is natural as Dr. Neilson spent so many years in the country of his birth. Nearly half are younger scholars, out of deference to his greater interest in the younger than the older ones. The contributions are fairly evenly divided among economics, sociology, political science, social philosophy, social history and social archaeology.

Originally I invited the late Helen Swift Neilson to edit the number. She declined, as having been too intimately associated with its subject. She accepted an invitation to contribute, however, and at her death in 1945 was engaged in working on a sociological study of the Houses of Parliament for these pages.

In handling the large correspondence which this volume has entailed I have had the assistance of Miss V. G. Peterson, who rendered service far beyond her responsibilities, and Miss Phyllis Evans. Miss Evans edited one of the manuscripts and assisted Miss Peterson with the proofs, besides producing the bibliography which is a contribution to the literature.

WILL LISSNER

(Reproduction forbidden except with the written permission of the author concerned).

Preface

"A BACKWARD GLANCE o'er travelled roads" may reveal, according to the spectacles we wear, something that is irretrievably gone or a prospect that is identical with the present except for the date line. Customs and costumes change but the mutual relations of human beings represent an unbroken line. Ambitions, ideals, methods, remain just as they were when anciently reported concerning the eagle in the air, the serpent upon a rock and the man with a maid.

The desire for wealth leads man into the pitfalls that have always existed. Witness the petty American cabinet minister convicted of conspiracy to defraud the government; then look back on the great Bacon, "meanest of mankind," as the poet somewhat rashly denominated him, who pleaded guilty of bribery.

Prescriptions for Utopias and for universal peace are as old as the hills and as young as the youngest idealist. The search for ever-deadlier weapons has gone on from the arrow to the atom. From the alchemist to the gold-brick swindler, man—as pseudo-scientist or plain swindler—has tried to convert the worthless into the precious. The perfect State and the perfect anarchism have alike been age-old ideals. Alexander II abolished serfdom, Abraham Lincoln signed an emancipation proclamation, but who would aver that slavery is not as real as it once was in Egypt!

All of this should not destroy optimism or create pessimism. The sun has shone since there has been a sun, but rain and snow have had an equally long life. The weather is ever with us. So is everything else with us. All that is new is old.

An infant discovers his thumb; infants have discovered thumbs for millions of years but thereby the joy of that discovery by the latest infant is not diminished.

When political and economic and racial strife lead to war does anyone notice that National Honor, prancing in shining hardware, is but a spavined nag that has been trotted out under the same name since time immemorial?

It has been said that the only lesson we can learn from history is that we learn nothing from history. May we, perhaps, learn from the present that there is no past, that what we regard as the past is but a marginal sketch on the great drawing eternally in the making, in which our era is, for the moment only, engaging the artist's crayon?

To see that great drawing in proper perspective it behooves one to read

history (or what passes for history), and biography, comparatively; the very lies about persons and events repeat themselves throughout the ages. Certain situations and crises evoke like emotions however great the interval of time that separates them. The troubadour and the ballad-singer, frankly recognizing the factor of entertainment in telling a tale, are the truest of biographers and historians for, though they may distort facts for the sake of rhyme or cadence, they are faithful to human impulses as they manifest themselves among high and low. Herodotus is a great entertainer, nevertheless his fictions have a purer ring than the heavily documented facts of historians through the thousands of years after him. Inspired *Dichtung* is *Wahrheit*.

Are these thoughts far afield in a volume intended to honor Francis Neilson? Hardly, for his production, open to every reader, manifests the thinker of comprehensive vision to whom the past is part of the present, to whom history—despite explosive interruptions or the illusion of drab pauses—is a continuum.

B. W. HUEBSCH

New York

Crusader for Justice:

A Tabloid Biography of Francis Neilson

By WILL LISSNER

I

THE LATE JOHN ARCHER of England was one of several writers who have essayed biographical sketches of Dr. Francis Neilson. He recounted that Neilson had been a laborer, actor, journalist, dramatist, novelist, lecturer, politician and producer. And then he asked, "Who has had a more interesting career?" So far as a modern figure is concerned, I do not believe Archer's challenge can be met. That was thirty years ago, three decades in which his subject undertook yet more varied activities. On that account, his question has even more point today.

However, there are three things wrong with Archer's catalogue. For one thing, it omits several important fields in which Francis Neilson has spent his energies. Actor, producer, journalist and politician he has been; but he has also been poet, essayist, patron in art and science and promoter of noble causes. For another, it lumps the fields in which he met with indifferent success, or none at all, with those in which he excelled. Neilson was hardly a paragon as a laborer either when he worked on the docks, dug the soil of Central Park, or clerked in a store; he worked with his hands only so that he might support himself while he was studying, cultivating his mind. As he himself has said, he worked only so long as it was necessary to get funds for his barest needs.

As an actor he attained only minor rôles; he had extraordinary talent for the theatre, but not for this branch of it. The study and practice he gave to acting were really only an apprenticeship for playwriting, in which he reached the top rank, and for stage direction, the task at which he earned a niche in theatrical history at the Duke of York's Theatre and at the Royal Opera in Covent Garden. His novels have high entertainment value and were useful in providing him with funds when he needed income. But I know of only one (disappointingly entitled "The Garden of Dr. Persuasion") that I would expect to outlive him, and until the present even this one has been appreciated by only a few critics of rare discernment. As a poet, the best one might say (on the basis of the published work, a necessary qualification, as I believe the great bulk is unpublished) is that he has written competent verse. Yet here again, it was his keen appreci-

ation of poetry and his effort to cultivate the writing of it that help to account, I think, for the original style he developed as an essayist. It was this style, along with the fecundity of his mind and the wide range of his scholarship, that helped to place him among the foremost essayists of his time.

And so it was with politics. A politician is not judged, according to current standards, by his influence upon the people for whom he speaks and acts. If he were, we would hardly approve Neilson's decision to quit politics. For after the Hyde Division of Cheshire had twice returned him to Parliament, it was said of him that "today there is no man, not even Lloyd George, who is known so well to the masses of people in England and Scotland and Wales." By the world's standards Neilson was an abysmal failure as a politician. Keen for the fight but anxious to avoid office, he chose for his first two contests the Newport Division of Shropshire, an old Tory seat considered to be a forlorn hope. Five years after he had entered the House of Commons in January, 1910, when, as the parliamentary head of the Radical bloc and as the leader of the Young Liberals, he had gained an enviable position in his country's political life, he was acknowledged by T. P. O'Connor and a host of others to be the outstanding worker of his time for democracy. Yet he threw it all over—office, position, even country itself—rather than compromise his principles. In his own view, and in that of any realistic critic of politics, he was an utter failure as a politician; he loathed the occupation. Yet because he was, he, more than almost any other man in his party at the time—his older colleagues, John Morley and Henry Campbell-Bannerman, of course, are the chief exceptions—earned the accolade of statesmen.

But what is more objectionable about summarizing Neilson's career by listing the fields in which he has worked is that it gives the impression that he was a versatile genius who scattered his energies in any field that struck the fancy of the moment. This is not so. The impression is wholly false. For if one studies his activities with care and insight, one sees at once that they are of a piece; they form a consistent pattern. The stage, the platform, the legislative hall, the periodical journal, the book—all these were but media through which he could reach the people with an integrated program by which they might realize their own highest capacities. Actor, poet, politician! Journalist, producer, essayist! The very detail of the catalogue, truthful though it is, obscures the real man. It is a simple thing that Neilson is—and has been all his mature life—a cultural leader among the English-speaking people. Archer had the clue to this when he reported

that Neilson, "the greatest platform speaker in England," reached "hundreds of thousands of the workers" of Britain "with his pamphlets," but he seems not to have realized the significance of these facts. Precisely because it was Neilson's vocation to serve as a cultural leader, in his personality were fused the man of letters and the man of action.

What I shall try to do in this brief essay on the career of Dr. Neilson is set out the pattern into which his activities have fallen. In this way, perhaps, I can contribute more toward the understanding of the man than by any mere exhaustive collection of the facts about him, or by any recital of the successes and honors that have come to him.

II

FRANCIS NEILSON was born in Birkenhead, across the River Mersey from Liverpool, in 1867. He came of an ancient English family and an old Scottish family. On one side he was a Butters, a family that lived in England, as Neilson put it, before "the days of the Norman land-grabbers"; the name is found among others familiar in Saxon times in the Domesday Book of William the Conqueror. An ancestor on this side was associated in the publication of the first modern newspaper.¹ On the other side he came of the same stock as David Hume and William Ewart Gladstone; this branch lately had been settled in Dundee.

He was the eldest of nine children, born into a household where both parents had to work, leaving little time for home life except on Sundays. As a small child he went to live, for a time, with his grandparents in Wellington, in Shropshire. The old folks' cottage was in the valley of the Wrekin, a mountain about which the Shropshire folk had woven hoary legends. The child imagined (with the older folk of Shropshire) that strange beings inhabited the mountain and that a giant had formed it by taking spoonfuls of earth and dropping them on the site one at a time. In that environment he gained early a love for the countryside where, as A. E. Housman sang,

In farm and field through all the shire
The eye beholds the heart's desire.

His grandfather initiated him into the lore of the common folk. One of the old man's sayings remained with Neilson all his life: "Larning's for the

¹ His father's name was Butters, his mother's Neilson. When he went on the stage he had his name changed legally from Butters to Neilson. He was too well known by his stage name when he entered politics to revert to his family name. This, I believe, is the explanation of the stage name: When he entered the theatre there was a rather well known actor of established reputation by the stage name of Frank Butters so, following theatrical custom, Neilson had to adopt his mother's name to avoid confusion.

rich; *nous* (native wit) is for the poor." The grandfather instilled in him a love for gardening and flowers that was to be a lifelong interest; the influence is seen clearly in the novel Neilson wrote in his mid-seventies, "Dr. Persuasion."² One of the child's favorite hobbies, a sport to which the grandsire had introduced him, was to go out into the country bird-nesting, or looking for flowers, berries or odd plants. That, as Housman tells us, was an integral part of Shropshire life:

The boys are up the woods with day
To fetch the daffodils away,
And home at noonday from the hills
They bring no dearth of daffodils.

Afield for palms the girls repair,
And sure enough the palms are there,
And each will find by hedge or pond
Her waving silver-tufted wand.

This love of nature and the out-of-doors was a formative influence as well as an essential part of his education. It developed in him the habit of keen observation from which he was to learn much. And more, it imbued him with the habit of reflection. These are graces that nature's temple bestows upon its devotees. The Shropshire poet has pictured its attractions:

Once in the wind of morning
I ranged the thymy wold;
The world-wide air was azure
And all the brooks ran gold.

There through the dews beside me
Behold a youth that trod,
With feathered cap on forehead,
And poised a golden rod. . . .

Oh whence, I asked, and whither?
He smiled and would not say,
And looked at me and beckoned
And laughed and led the way.

This Shropshire experience must be accounted the first important stage of his development. It was his introduction to the world of beauty, which he recreated in eloquence upon the platform, in setting and imagery upon the stage, in image and allusion upon the printed page. The impact it made

² This book, published in 1942, is the story of a practical mystic who by his ministrations changed the course of life in an English village. Neilson wrote it to demonstrate the usefulness of mystical religion in everyday life.

upon the personality of the boy can be seen in Neilson's yet unpublished "Reminiscences." The section that deals with Shropshire is another boyhood idyl that, if published, may rank with Clemens's and Tarkington's.

Schooldays began for him in Wellington and were continued in Liverpool. His formal schooling was not very successful; he frequently played truant. The truth was that he hated school. He would rather go to the race course to watch the horses being trained or paced,³ or to a high hill to lie on his back and watch the clouds drift by, or to almost anywhere else out-of-doors than sit in a stuffy classroom. Two teachers, however, made an impression on him, Sir John Bayley in Wellington and James Seward at the Liverpool Institute, Neilson's secondary school. Seward, a teacher of history and composition, read to the class Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus" and "Past and Present." Later, when the centenary edition of Carlyle's works was published, Neilson read each volume as it appeared while traveling on the underground to work at the Royal Opera. Seward inspired the boy to study for himself and to seek to learn to write.

Neilson's boyhood schooling was not without influence on the man; but it was a minor influence. Formally, at any rate, it came to an end at 14, when he was apprenticed to a firm of engineers for five years; the total pay stipulated was £100. Neilson was unsuccessful in the engineering trade for it did not capture his interest.

A fact of greater import is that while he played truant from the classroom, he did not largely give up his time to self-indulgence. He spent much time at the docks in Liverpool and Birkenhead, talking to the sailors. Since the eighteenth century the port had been given up largely to the West Indian and the American trade, but its ships roamed the seven seas. From the sailormen the boy learned of foreign ports and foreign ways. Their tales taught him the variety of cargoes, the things of which they were made, and the things into which, in the course of further exchange and production, they would be turned. It was a practical course in geography, physical and human, in economics and other fields of knowledge, and the student who sat on a pile of rope listening to the world traveler spinning his yarn was an apt, sensitive and impressionable one. Besides the docks, he roamed the streets, and these, like the alleys of any metropolis, had their lore to contribute to him. He haunted the Liverpool Exchange and he learned more of its functioning at first hand than he might have gained from a textbook.

But he had early acquired a love for books, with an especial fondness

³ Until the second world war, he bred racehorses at his stud in England. One, Foletta, won the Princess Mary Stakes in 1938 and the Britannia Stakes in 1939.

for illustrated books. On rainy days he would pore over the pictures in a "History of England" or a "History of the Franco-Prussian War." On his walks he discovered the Liverpool free library, museum and gallery of arts, and here he was a frequent visitor. The library established by Sir William Brown and the gallery erected by Sir Andrew Walker broadened his knowledge from the practical to the aesthetic arts. He also discovered the theatre and, naturally, the Shakespearean theatre. As often as he could manage it he would buy a ticket to the gallery to see the plays performed. Here one of the vehicles in which he was to express himself made its impact. Similarly he made the acquaintance of music. The town was noted for its triennial music festivals, which its principal building, St. George's Hall, was erected to accommodate. As a youth Neilson sang in the choir of the Presbyterian church and took lessons on the organ there.

The information that he gathered for himself in this way was always a source of wonder to his family. "Where does the boy get his knowledge?" his mother often would remark. This questing for knowledge on his own must be set down as one of the large influences of his early life. But it was of inferior importance, as a formative influence, to his home environment. Neilson is very largely a product of his family. His father, an uneducated man, learned to read and write as an adult. Despite his late start, or perhaps because of it, he acquired a taste for the best in literature. He took pride in the library he gathered, from the second hand book stalls, at great sacrifice. Dickens, Thackeray and Trollope were in it, along with Butler's "Analogy of Religion" and Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." Wordsworth, Milton, Shelley and Keats sang in its pages. Uneducated though he had been, the father was a cultured man, a Liberal of the old school. His library had practically all the speeches and pamphlets of Cobden and Bright that were the product of the campaigns for the repeal of the corn laws, the campaigns that helped to end the "Hungry Forties." The father gathered around him weekly men of similar cultivation and they debated and discussed the great questions of the day in ideas, in politics and economics. The group was catholic in its interests; Rationalists and their opponents, land reformers and capital reformers, all were present. Good Liberals, doubtless, predominated. Here Neilson was steeped in the history of Liberalism and in the Radical tradition, for he, like the other children, was permitted to listen, though they could not be suffered to take part.

But the father influenced the boy in other ways. He required the Bible to be read to the family each Sunday night, and to the eldest son fell the rôle of lector. Francis was asked to read the assigned chapter many times

during the week so that he might repeat it from memory on Sunday. Several of the Psalms, chapters from Isaiah and parables from the New Testament stuck to his memory. The father also encouraged the boy to read Shakespeare. Discovering that the young truant was frequenting the Shakespearean theatre, he subscribed for the Knight edition of the poet's plays. For ten years the books were Francis's constant companions at home and the boy frequently was asked, at a family gathering, to give a reading from them. Once when he was 16 he decided to give the first act of "Hamlet" at a party his parents planned. For eight months he rehearsed his brothers, sisters and playmates in their rôles, he himself undertaking the title rôle. Each of the players made his own costume (some of the draperies of Francis's mother costumed Ophelia); the troupe built the scenery. The audience was duly appreciative and indulgent.

Besides his father and his father's friends, Neilson was considerably influenced by his uncle, George Neilson, a learned Constitutional Radical. The latter knew Latin and history, and had steeped himself in Matthew Arnold. Francis was permitted to join the circle of his Uncle George's three children when his uncle shared with the younger members of the family the works that had aroused his interest. Through the uncle the boy became acquainted with John Stuart Mill. George Neilson read aloud to the children from the "Political Economy" and the "Essay on Liberty." Passages from Green's "Short History of the English People," Ruskin's "Stones of Venice" and Macaulay's "Essays" were etched by the uncle on the boy's memory. The readings inspired the boy to study the classics of English literature. These home influences we must account the third and most important stage of Neilson's development. From the fields of Shropshire he harvested a love of beauty. On the docks and streets of Liverpool he acquired urbanity and self-reliance. But in his home he was introduced to the cultural heritage of the English-speaking people, to their hopes and aspirations. Here he acquired the rudiments of the social philosophy that was to be the foundation of his social outlook throughout his lifetime, a social philosophy that was to dictate the channels in which he was to direct his energies and interests. In the English Bible, in Shakespeare, in Butler, Ruskin and Macaulay he learned to think and speak in simple English, in direct, clear and forceful language enriched by simile and analogy drawn from the teeming life around him. Francis Neilson, the writer, learned the bases of his craft in his father's parlor.

III

THE ENGINEERING FIRM to which Francis Neilson had been apprenticed offered him, as I have indicated, no hope for a career. His interests led in

other directions. When he was 18 he decided to try his luck in the United States. He sailed for New York on the *Scythia* as a third class passenger and was seasick all the way over. A friend awaited him, a young Englishman who shared a small flat with two other young men on Forty-Eighth Street. Neilson took a hansom cab to the address and it cost him ten dollars, almost the last cent he had with him; the driver had taken him in circles to the place.

He had to go to work at once. He found a job in Washington Market where he also was able to sleep. It was a clerkship; when the truckmen came in, starting at midnight, he checked in the produce they delivered. Then he had to record sales and shipments. The hours were long, leaving him little time for himself. He took another job on the docks on West Street. The longshore employment lasted only two days, however. Then he was hit on the head as a "scab." When he woke up in the hospital he was told that if he wanted to work on the docks he would have to pay the fee and join the union.

Instead he went to work as a common laborer, helping with pick and shovel in the reconstruction of Central Park. Thirty-five years later, and again sixty years later, he was to occupy an apartment decorated with *objets d'art* which overlooked the section of the park in which he had worked. It was typical of him that, as he looked from the window and enjoyed the beauty of the lower end of the park, he would tell his friends proudly—and truthfully—"I helped to build that." But the winter of 1885-86 was a hard one for him as he knocked about from job to job. The period was not a wasted one; he was learning to fend for himself in a hard school. Beyond that, however, his development did not proceed until the summer of 1887, when he got a job as a clerk with the Waggoner Palace Car Company in the yards at Forty-Second Street. Here, as an employee of the predecessor of the Pullman Company, it was his task to check in and out the linen used by the porters.

In the course of his work he became acquainted with a man named Johnson, a Negro of powerful physique who at 32 had graduated as a doctor of medicine and had qualified fully as a lawyer—yet, because of his color, was working as a Pullman porter. Johnson brought home to him what it meant to be a member of an underprivileged group, the unskilled and semi-skilled group of white laborers to which Neilson belonged, or the group barred from better occupations regardless of skill or training because of racial discrimination, to which Johnson belonged. Explaining his occupation, Johnson once remarked bitterly, "The white folks treat us like dirt, but

they've no time to waste in cleaning up their own filth." And again, "Colored men may get as good an education as any white man in this country, but when it comes to trying their hand at making a practice in one of the professions for which they are qualified, they soon find it is better to empty the slops of the white folks." Neilson later was to come to understand why groups, with their rights stolen from them by other groups, had become underprivileged; he was to understand the economic and social bases of group discrimination. Through all his lifetime, he was never to forget Johnson's bitter recriminations—which hurt precisely because they were true—against his kind. This reinforced the family influences that dedicated him to be a lifelong crusader for justice for man living in society.

It was the porter who had been educated beyond his opportunities who woke Neilson up to the fact that he was wasting his time merely earning his living, that if he were to get anywhere in life he would have to buckle down to study and learn to excel in a field that would attract his interests. The following winter Neilson, now 20, went to Boston. Part of the time he clerked in a dry goods store. Part of the time he was out of work, and it was the coldest winter in the memory of residents. When his stomach was growling for want of food he wondered why life was so hard, work so scarce and a modicum of comfort so rarely to be obtained even by those willing and able to labor for it. This was the beginning of his higher education in social reconstruction, for he started in earnest to seek the answer to his question. He began to attend all the free lectures he could find, particularly when they were held indoors, where he could keep warm. He spent the free time that unemployment afforded him in the Boylston Street Library, reading every work it contained on socialism. It proved no answer to his problem.

Before he left Boston and returned to New York, Neilson began trying his hand at writing. This was one of the turning points of his life, but it is doubtful if he recognized it as such. For New York, at first, was no more hospitable to him than Boston had been. He was in and out of jobs. For a while he worked at Stern Brothers department store, then located at Twenty-Third Street. He held many another job with no future and offering very little pay. But he was still going to lectures as often as he could, and with all the money he could spare he was buying and reading avidly second-hand books. He was able to live on five dollars a week and he worked only long enough to assure himself this pittance. What confirmed him in his quest for a self-acquired education was an incident at a lecture at Cooper Union. The speaker had referred to Henry George, and

in the question period Neilson sought more information about the social philosopher. By way of answer, the speaker took out of his pocket a paper covered copy of "Progress and Poverty" and gave it to him. The book, with its many references to great works of the past, revived his interest in the classics.

At the close of this period of drifting, Neilson found work on the stage as a "super"; as usual in such a job, he carried a spear or he helped to make up crowds. Now he was finding himself. He was engaged at last in work that gave him satisfaction, if little money; he did not need much money. It left his days free and in the daytime he frequented the Astor Library, the Metropolitan Museum and the Cooper Institute. Pictures, music and books consoled him in his poverty. At the library he read voraciously in the classics, the "Iliad," the "Odyssey," Pindar, Hesiod, the dramatists, Plato, Thucydides, Herodotus, Livy—all that had been translated. His later interest in archaeology had its beginning at this time.

IV

AN AMBITIOUS NOVICE at writing and acting, Francis Neilson made the acquaintance of men who made it a point to help the neophyte. One was Dion Boucicault, who encouraged him to try for supporting rôles and gave him many a pointer on handling them. Another was James Gibbons Huneker, the essayist and music critic, who was then on *The Musical Courier* and occasionally used squibs from Neilson in his column. Huneker gave the youth advice on improving his writing and encouraged him to submit articles and verse to the newspapers, particularly the old *Recorder*, and the magazines. Occasionally now Neilson had an article published in *The Dramatic Mirror*, and once in a while a newspaper would publish a verse or a story of his.

Times still were hard with him, though he was making his way. He spent one summer when he was very hard up with the Forepaugh, Barnum and Bailey Circus, playing, in pantomime, the rôle of Sardanapalus in "The Fall of Nineveh." By now he was a keen student of dramatic technique and a rebel against the prevailing schools of acting and stage management. Emboldened by the increasing acceptance of his freelance writings, he undertook to do a series of articles for *The Theatre* magazine in which he set forth his criticisms of the New York stage and his own theories of acting and stage management. The series was particularly critical of the work of Dion Boucicault, the veteran dramatist, who was then running a school of dramatic art at the Madison Square Theatre. Boucicault was

annoyed by the criticism. Through a fellow-boarder in Neilson's rooming house, Neilson and Boucicault were brought together.

Boucicault offered to take him on as a free pupil. "Instead of taking bread out of my mouth by abusing my methods of teaching," the dramatist said, "let me try to teach you to act, and if you have sense enough to learn I'll make a player of you." Neilson accepted and remained with Boucicault until the latter died in 1890. Though he never became a partisan of Boucicault's methods, he "learned more from him than from anyone." He said later, "I owe him everything."

It was Boucicault, incidentally, who discovered precisely where Neilson's talent for the theatre lay. After working with the youth for some time, Boucicault advised him to give up attempting to become an actor. "You would do well as a stage manager," he said. "You should devote yourself to that." But for the time being, the old playwright's advice was lost against his pupil's dogged determination. Trouping around the states, Neilson played many parts, in one-night stands and extended engagements. Tall and handsome, with a striking presence, he was cast chiefly in juvenile rôles—which he loathed—or in the heavy lead. What he was anxious to get were 'character' parts; luckily for him, they were refused him.

After Boucicault was laid to rest in the Little Church Around the Corner, Neilson joined the company of William Gillette. His theatrical fortunes were now rapidly ascendant. He became acquainted with Victor Herbert, an association which was to start him on his career in playwriting and in music. For Victor Herbert's music he wrote the libretto for a comic opera, "La Vivandière." The work was stillborn. But the next on which they collaborated, "Prince Ananias," written for the Bostonians, a well known musical society of that time, turned out to be a smash hit when, two years later, in 1894, it was produced at the Broadway Theatre. A road company toured the country with it in 1895. Through Victor Herbert, in 1891, he met Anton Seidl, the conductor. Seidl adopted Neilson as his protégé and treated him as a son. Seidl directed his studies in music and encouraged him to make new prompt books for all the "Ring" operas of Wagner, for "Tristan and Isolde" and for "Die Meistersinger."

Chance, meanwhile, gave him his first opportunity as a stage manager, fulfilling Boucicault's prediction. Gillette asked him to assist in producing the play "Ninety Days." It was a failure, but Neilson's work in it attracted the notice of Charles Frohman. Frohman engaged Neilson in 1892 to assist Roberts, his stage manager, in producing "The Sporting Dutchess." The assistant stage manager played three or four small parts and was understudy

for two of the leading rôles. It was the beginning of an extended association with Daniel and Charles Frohman for he was sent to London with "The Sporting Dutchess" company as stage manager and actor. When he came back to New York Charles Frohman kept him on as stage manager and actor—not until 1898 was he to drop acting.

Seidl had Neilson at the Philharmonic or the Metropolitan whenever he was conducting a symphony or an opera. Through Seidl Neilson met Anton Dvořák, the Czech composer, who had come to New York in 1892 to head the National Conservatory of Music. Dvořák was looking for material about the North American Indians, about whom he hoped to write a cantata. Neilson was commissioned by the pair to do a libretto. He turned out the rough draft of "Manabozo," but he found so much material that he recommended to Dvořák that they tackle a full length opera. But Dvořák, who had become interested in the Negro melodies, did not want to undertake such a large work; before he returned to Europe in 1895 he had immortalized the folk music of the American Negro in the themes of the "New World Symphony."

Seidl had been eager to do an opera. Dvořák had suggested that he do a cantata on the "Hiawatha" theme but the idea did not interest Seidl. From Dvořák Neilson brought his libretto to Seidl, and the latter at once began writing the music for it. Neilson and Seidl agreed to do a trilogy on the sagas of the Indians, of which "Manabozo" was to be the first part. The three acts of the part took several years to write; Neilson completed them only four months before Seidl died, at 47, in 1898. Seidl, meanwhile, had been able to finish the music for only two of the acts; not until thirty years later was the music completed, with William Lester of Chicago taking up Seidl's task. The libretto was published in England in 1899 but it sold only 300 copies. It remains to be seen whether time will justify Seidl's faith in it.

In 1897 Neilson had a chance to return to England. William Gillette had written "Secret Service," one of his most memorable plays, and Charles Frohman wanted Neilson to take an American company in the drama to London as stage manager. Seidl urged him to accept and seek to make his way on the London stage. Seidl had contracted to go each Spring to London to conduct the Royal Opera. Neilson yielded to Seidl's persuasion. The play opened at the Adelphi in May, with the stage manager in the rôle of Lieutenant Maxwell, and was an outstanding success. Transferred to the Comedy Theatre for a time, it went back to the Adelphi and

in Au
run.

Bef
Cosim
to me
ocasi
and N
teen m
(who
Schul
tional
Neils
the m
an an
and so
his ic

Re
Whil
Van
Febru
produ
Ursu
Chris
val."
in-La
go at
Some
W

Quee
vaile
invit
tutio
cont
unde
H
with
"Ma
Thro

in August an English company headed by William Terriss carried on the run.

Before Neilson left New York Seidl had received an invitation from Cosima Wagner to return to Bayreuth to conduct "Parsifal." They agreed to meet there if at all possible. The festival was more than a musical occasion; it was a gathering place for the intellectuals of Europe and Seidl and Neilson met many of them. One party in Seidl's honor attracted fourteen men to the Reichstadler and among them were Beyerlein, George Moore (whom Neilson was to know intimately later in London), Herman Klein, Schultz-Curtius and Massingham. They discussed Europe and internationalism. Nothing came of it. A more eventful meeting was between Neilson and Queen Alexandra and Lady de Grey. The two women were the moving spirits of the Royal Opera in London which, Archer says, "was an ancient institution with an old stage, battered scenery, tattered dresses and scarcely any facilities for doing opera on a modern scale." Neilson, with his iconoclastic ideas, made an impression on the opera devotees.

Returning to London, he became Charles Frohman's representative there. While waiting for Frohman's activities to begin, he staged the opera, "Rip Van Winkle," for William Boosey at Her Majesty's Theatre. Beginning in February, 1898, Frohman took over the Duke of York's Theatre. Neilson produced a succession of plays for him, including "The Adventure of Lady Ursula," "The Cowboy and the Lady," "An American Citizen," "The Christian," "Miss Hobbs," "Madame Butterfly" and "The Lackey's Carnival." At the Criterion he directed "The Masked Ball" and "My Daughter-in-Law" and at the Vaudeville "Self and Lady." Meanwhile he had another go at opera, staging "Tristan and Isolde" for the Carl Rosa Opera Company. Sometimes he rehearsed three plays at one time.

What Neilson did in "Rip Van Winkle" and "Tristan" was not lost on Queen Alexandra and Lady de Grey. Before the season of 1900 they prevailed on the directors of the Royal Opera at Covent Garden Theatre to invite Neilson to go there, put in a new stage, reorganize the whole institution and do opera on as big a scale as it had been done anywhere on the continent. As *The Era* of London reported, Covent Garden "structurally" underwent "many alterations" when Neilson took over.

He had continued to write short stories and short plays. While busy with his first season at the Royal Opera, he completed his first novel, "Madame Bohemia,"⁴ and it was published at the height of the season. Three Londoners took up in tutoring him for the writing craft where

⁴ This novel received exceptionally fine notices for a first effort.

Huneker had left off. They were George Douglas Brown, the novelist, who was on *The Illustrated London News*; David Meldrum of *Blackwood's Magazine* and James Symonds. Having made his way on the theatrical ladder to the top rung, Neilson was beginning at the bottom to learn the art of the essayist. In the latter field he was not to achieve his ambitions until twenty years later. His adventure in the theatre reached a quicker climax. But then, politics had not intervened.

V

DURING THE BOER WAR Neilson's interest in politics was aroused. His home in the pre-Raphaelite village of Bedford Park was a center for a group of men on the ascendant in journalism, music, literature and politics. It became the battle ground of many of the Radicals of the time. Brown, who was writing a Life of Kruger, asked Neilson's help in ferreting out the diplomatic documents. Neilson, though he was working twelve or fourteen hours a day directing companies, reading plays, writing and giving lectures, found time to give it. The activity enlisted him in a lifelong fight against imperialism.

What set him off as a politician, however, was Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's budget in 1902, placing duties on wheat. Neilson began speaking on land value taxation, which had been adopted into the Liberal platform a few years before, and on free trade, then still the main Liberal plank.

After he had been four seasons at Covent Garden and had established an international reputation for his stage direction there, Lord de Grey, husband of his sponsor, suggested that he assist in the reorganization of the Liberal party. The great Liberal revival was then on the horizon. Neilson threw himself wholeheartedly into the task. Henry Campbell-Bannerman was proclaiming that "our policy is the policy of freedom in all things which affect the lives of the people." Neilson became the Liberal candidate in his grandfather's district, the Newport Division of Shropshire—a safe Tory seat, even in a landslide. Free from the burden of office, he could campaign up and down the country for the other candidates. He supported himself, meanwhile, by his pen and by lecturing.

In these activities he demonstrated his ability as an organizer, pulling together the loose threads of a campaign as if it were a play. But he was no party hack. He fought on the basis of principle. An incident in 1906, after the Taft-Vale decision making labor union funds amenable to seizure by the State, is illustrative. He was sent up to the West Riding of York-

shire to help the candidate. The miners told him if his man was not prepared to vote to reverse the decision, he had better not waste his time. Neilson repeated the demand to the candidate. "What shall I do?" appealed the man. "Do?" Neilson replied. "Do whatever your conscience tells you to do. I shan't tell you how to pledge yourself." The candidate had no stomach for that kind of politics. He rang up party headquarters in London and Herbert Gladstone advised him to make the pledge. He did, and was elected. The decision was reversed by the new Parliament.

In the general election of 1906 Liberalism swept the polls and was at the beginning of its last great bid for power. Campbell-Bannerman captured the imagination of the people with his watchword: "Let us colonize our own country; let us make our country more a treasure house of the people and less of a pleasure ground for the rich." In the general election, as in the by-election of 1908, Neilson contested the safe Tory seat.⁵ By now he was the leader of the young Liberals.⁶ Over the opposition of Gladstone and the older leaders of the party, he and his associates were determined to do battle with the Fabian Socialists on the basis of a Radical program. From their labors in stumping up and down the country, making speeches, giving lectures and taking part in debates,⁷ came, beginning in 1907, the Land Values Campaign, which culminated in Lloyd George's land values budget of 1909. Lloyd George asked a question on everyone's mind: "Who gave the land of Great Britain as a perquisite for the few, and made the rest of us aliens in the land of our birth?" When the House of Lords intervened to protect land monopoly, the Liberals went to the country.

In the resulting general election, Neilson stood for the Hyde Division of

⁵ He very nearly won, however. Ashley Mitchell, the distinguished British liberal leader, reports that "Neilson put the landed aristocracy into a positive panic when he almost won an election in one of their rural areas of Shropshire." Cf. his brief memorandum, "Francis Neilson, a Great Liberal," of Nov. 22, 1946, which I have deposited with the Neilson papers.

⁶ Ashley Mitchell says that the huge majority in 1906 "was largely due to the tireless propaganda of a band of stalwarts of whom Francis Neilson was a shining star." Cf. his memorandum.

⁷ For the flavor of the debates, see the transcripts of two of them in pamphlets in the Neilson papers: Willie Dyson and Francis Neilson, "Tariff Reform and Employment," Annan, Scotland, Newbie Liberal Committee, 1909; Francis Neilson and L. S. Amery; "The Taxation of Land Values versus Tariff Reform," Shrewsbury, England, Livesey Ltd., 1909.

At this time he helped to organize the Brotherhood Movement. Francis Neilson gives this account of it: "This grew out of the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon meetings, which were organized by men attending the Nonconformist Chapels. They determined to 'relieve the clergy of the trouble of discussing social problems from the pulpit, and thus enable them to devote their sermons to things of the spirit.' The order of the meetings was: the Lord's Prayer, a reading from the Bible, three hymns, a speech upon any subject except party politics, and a benediction. The service lasted only an hour."

Cheshire, the county in which he was born, and won. As the representative of the industrial city, he entered the House of Commons in January, 1910, and remained in it until his retirement from politics in 1915. In the House he headed the Land Values Bloc and from 1912 to 1915 he served as president of the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values. Philip Snowden has charged publicly that the land reform policy failed of adoption because Lloyd George betrayed it. Neilson's explanation is that the party betrayed itself by giving itself up to superficial reforms; Lloyd George, he says, "proved incompetent." Personally, I find Snowden's charge plausible. But Neilson's statement that the great Liberal revival was crushed, after the Agadir crisis of 1911, by imperialism is beyond cavil. When Asquith, Grey and Haldane formed a war party, it was the end of the possibilities of social reform.

As Richard Cobden had done earlier, Neilson threw himself into the fight against imperialism. But the odds were too great. The declaration of war in 1914 ended the fight. Then it was that he wrote his first book to become celebrated, "How Diplomats Make War." In a white heat of indignation, he dictated it in six weeks to his daughter, Marion, who served as his secretary. He was determined to expose the machinations of the war-makers. At first the publishers spurned it. It was brought out anonymously in the United States in 1915 and went through a succession of printings and translations. It was credited with initiating the literature of the Great Disillusionment. Neilson, meanwhile, resigned his seat in Parliament, retired from his position in his party, and quitted England for the United States, where he foreswore his allegiance to the Crown and became an American citizen. He was through with politics.

VI

THE EXTRAORDINARY SUCCESS of "How Diplomats Make War" encouraged him to devote himself thereafter to a literary career. At first, to recoup his fortunes, he went on a lecture tour. Playing the Chatauqua circuit was no new experience for him; in 1912 he had traveled 7,600 miles to deliver thirty-six speeches in twenty-nine days. Now, however, his health was broken by his labors in Parliament.

His novel, "A Strong Man's House," was published in 1916. Luckily for him, for he needed the money, it was well received. It was the story of the disillusionment of a munitions manufacturer who believed that the way to prevent war was to prepare for it.

But soon he was enbroiled in journalism again. From 1906 until 1908 he had got out *The Democratic Monthly* in England and it had proved a powerful medium for disseminating his ideas. Perhaps with that experience in mind, but knowing, anyhow, that he was eager to take up the cudgels again for his philosophy, his second wife, the former Helen Swift Morris, was easy prey when Albert Jay Nock sought to persuade her to establish a weekly in New York. Mrs. Neilson and Nock overcame Neilson's misgivings and *The Freeman* was founded as a journal of opinion and a literary paper combined. From 1920 to 1924 Neilson was associated with Nock in the editorship and they were assisted by a remarkably able staff. It included Ben Huebsch, Suzanne LaFollette, Van Wyck Brooks, Geroid Tanquary Robinson and Walter Fuller. It fought gallantly for lost causes and it established new standards of periodical journalism.

Malcolm Cowley has lately written grudgingly of *The Freeman* as having been dedicated to "good prose and the Single Tax." Good prose, prose as good as Addison ever achieved, indeed was its preoccupation. But this is a superficial judgment. Its dedications were to Native Radicalism in politics and public affairs, the best in the world's literature and cosmopolitanism and urbanity in the approach to the arts. It was a civilizing influence, as powerful an antidote to American provincialism and cultural isolationism in the twenties as Huneker's essays had been after the turn of the century. Virtually every important writer here and abroad contributed to it. It died because at best it attracted only 7,000 subscribers (could the founders have hoped for more?), too few to support an undertaking operating on so grand a scale. It was a period, moreover, when literary magazines were in a decline that has persisted until this day and when the literary supplements of newspapers were supplanting them as advertising media; a period when commercialism was engulfing American publishing.

What *The Freeman* demonstrated was that the English do not have a monopoly of the ability to turn out memorable reviews, although one would think that they do, considering the estate of our reviews and theirs today. It was almost wholly an American enterprise and it showed that American writers and critics, given adequate support, could turn out a review that would stand comparison with the best English product. But it also proved that Americans, by and large, were not cultivated enough to provide an adequate readership for so serious an effort. When the time is ripe, though not perhaps in my lifetime, the eight large volumes of the paper will provide a model for a similar band of literary adventurers.

After *The Freeman* suspended, the Neilsons returned to the midwest. Except when they were traveling in this country or abroad, they lived in Chicago in the winter and spent their summers in Wisconsin. In 1924 Neilson returned to playwriting with "The Sin Eater's Hallowe'en," a dramatic satire on international politics that made use of English folklore. Until 1929 he turned out a series of plays, culminating with "Le Baiser de Sang," which was presented at the Grand Guignol in Paris in that year and revived in 1937.

The Great Depression, developing into the collapse of 1932-33, brought him back to essay writing, although now his vehicle was the book rather than the periodical. The books this turn in his interests produced fall into several classes. First, there are the political essays. In this class he had turned out in 1919 "The Old Freedom," a work in which he had sought to bring Wilsonian liberalism down to earth. Entering the fray against the Fabianism of Roosevelt's New Deal, he turned out "Control from the Top" in 1933 and "Sociocratic Escapades" in 1934. Then there are the satires and polemics, including "A Professor's Hotchpotch" in 1934, "Hate, the Enemy of Peace," in 1944 and "The Devil and All" in 1945; I would account these minor works.

Of permanent value are the books in which his social philosophy is set out in a systematic way. This group includes "The Eleventh Commandment" turned out in 1933, "Man at the Crossroads" (1938), "In Quest of Justice" (1944), "The Roots of our Learning" (1946), and a book scheduled for publication in 1947 which is as yet untitled. These last two books, like the theme essay of the preceding one, consist of essays contributed to THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

Neilson had nothing to do with the founding of this JOURNAL and when he was first invited to write for it he shied away, perhaps because his experience with *The Freeman* was too green in his memory. The contributions by which he was represented in the early issues were reprints of papers written for other occasions. But he soon came around when he saw what the review was promising to accomplish (he gave it moral support from the first) and how much a writer of his mettle was needed. He tells his friends that THE JOURNAL's assignments gave him a new lease on life at a time when, save for a single major project, he was prepared to retire. But knowing what little likelihood there is that he will retire while he retains possession of his faculties, I set his story down as an effort to make light of our demands upon his pen. At any rate the reader

can see for himself in these books that the pressure of his commitments to this JOURNAL has resulted in some of the best writing of which he is capable. In these essays on religious, cultural and sociological investigations, as in the earlier ones that compose "The Eleventh Commandment," he shares the fruits of his lifelong studies with his readers. And more important than that, he enlists them in his lifelong crusade for justice.

This list of publications is a rather long one, and it is by no means all-inclusive; less salient details are avoided. Certainly it is a record of which any man, at 80, might be proud. But I have reserved until now mention of his scholar's master-work, his writing of "The Tragedy of Europe" in five volumes. He began the writing of it while the second world war was in the making and he turned out 3,500 printed pages. Written from the viewpoint of his Constitutional Radicalism, it is a day-by-day commentary on the war, an effort to discover its causes, a record and analysis of its development, an assessment of its results and, most important of all, an attempt to learn how peace may be won and maintained. The very enormity of the task is staggering. It was completed after his wife died and he had returned to New York to live in 1945.

It would be gratuitous at this time to attempt to present any definitive account of this period in Dr. Neilson's life. For one thing, happily, though he is 80, the period is by no means ended. The projects in which he is engaged may, if completed, cast his former works in a different perspective. For another, the material is wholly lacking. This period is not covered in his "Reminiscences," and I have had no opportunity to examine his voluminous correspondence. Indeed, I should be presuming upon intimacy and betraying confidences if I enlarged upon his activities during this time as a patron of art and science. I can only indicate the scope of his interests by mentioning that for a number of years he has maintained an archaeological expedition in the Near East; he provided the fund by which the musical works of William Byrd were collected and published and he made substantial contributions toward the building of Liverpool Cathedral.

What his career has amounted to up to now, however, can be set out briefly as an effort to socialize our heritage of beauty and an attempt to realize a social order based on justice. Books, like man's other deeds, often outlive their creators. It is much too early to try to discover how far Dr. Neilson's effort and attempt have succeeded. It can be said that for the truth that is in him, at 80, he is still fighting valiantly, still waging an epic

fight that for those who have come after remains an inspiration—and a source of hope.⁸

New York

⁸ Bibliographical note: The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Miss Phyllis Evans, Dr. Neilson's literary secretary, for the assistance she gave him in gathering material for this study. Miss Evans made available to me the manuscript of Neilson's "Reminiscences" covering the period up to his entrance into politics, and made notes from the manuscript to facilitate its use. She also made available her bibliography of Neilson and the following items, all that were in her files: John Archer, "Francis Neilson," *Indiana Forum*, n.d.; John Archer, "Neilson of Hyde," Hyde, England, J. Andrews & Co., n.d.; "London's Stage Managers: A Chat with Francis Neilson," *The Era*, London, Dec. 8, 1900; Eileen Campbell, "Francis Neilson, A Man of Achievement," *On the Campus*, Chicago, June, 1944. I have incorporated some data gleaned from conversations with the subject and other matter from standard sources on the theatre and on British Liberalism. Dr. Neilson, of course, has not seen the manuscript and it was not possible to submit it to Miss Evans; there is, therefore, nothing "official" about the study. I doubt if an adequate biographical study can be written until Dr. Neilson's "Reminiscences" and his letters are published.

Henry George and Karl Marx

A Plutarchian Experiment

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

HENRY GEORGE AND KARL MARX were coevals. Their lives did not exactly synchronize, as George (1839–1897) was born twenty-one years later than Marx (1818–1883), and died fourteen years later. But in their careers they were contemporaries in the heart of the nineteenth century.

The two men never met. Karl Marx did not visit America; Henry George visited Ireland and England in 1881–82, but apparently did not encounter Marx. There is no record of the two men communicating with one another, and scant record of their discussing one another's works. George Raymond Geiger¹ quotes "practically the only written mention of George by Marx" in a letter to the latter's friend, Sorge, from London, June 30, 1881. Conceding that George was "a writer of talent," Marx insisted that "the man is in theory completely 'behind the times.' He understands nothing of the nature of surplus value. . . . He has the repugnant arrogance and presumption which inevitably mark all such panacea-breeders." H. M. Hyndman tells the story of Marx looking through a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and exclaiming "with a sort of friendly contempt, 'the capitalists' last ditch!'" George returned these compliments in scattered comments upon Marx. Thus, in a letter to Hyndman (1884), he wrote that Marx "lacked analytical power and logical habits of thought. . . . He certainly seems to me . . . a most superficial thinker." Again, in a letter to an English friend (1890), George characterizes Marx as "the prince of muddle-heads."

¹ In "The Philosophy of Henry George," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1933, pp. 237–8.

Only in such casual clashes as these did the swords of the two protagonists cross.

It is unlikely, had Karl Marx and Henry George ever met, or ever studied profoundly one another's thought, that they would have agreed even on small matters. It is true that they were stirred by the same sentiment, a horror of poverty; that they were fixed in the same conviction, that poverty is a product of social injustice and therefore unnecessary; that they were dedicated to the same resolve, to correct injustice and abolish poverty. But in their understanding of the problem and their remedy of its evil, they were as far apart as the two poles. Marx with his Socialism and George with his Single Tax moved in precisely opposite directions. Rivals for two generations in the same great field of economic and political reform, they were molded as though by destiny to fundamental differences. The contrast between these men is amazing.

II

THUS, KARL MARX was a German Jew, a European. He lived in a crowded continent, later in a crowded England, where everything was so old as to run back to ancient times. Henry George was an American, who lived in the vast spaces of a land that was sparsely inhabited and new to history. It was easy for Marx to see things as coming to an end, whereas it was inevitable that George should see things as still in process of beginning.

Marx was the product of a decadent feudalism and emerging capitalism, in which class distinctions, as between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, for example, were still predominant. George was the product of a free society, in which class distinctions were unknown, or at least unrecognized; the very words, "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie," were not a part of the American language. An interpretation of the social problem in terms of a class struggle was therefore as

natural, indeed inevitable, to the former as it was unnatural and abhorrent to the latter.

Karl Marx knew little of democracy; to the end of his days he had contempt for the common people, and no confidence at all in their ability to work out their problems by indirect methods of persuasion and political action. Henry George, on the other hand, was a citizen in a democracy; he trusted the common people, and the exercise of their power as free men to determine destiny. The idea of a dictatorship of the workers, for however long or short a time, which was an essential part of Marx's program, would never have entered George's head save to disgust and frighten him.

Karl Marx spent more than half of his life, and practically all the years of his productive activity, in England, which was the industrial leader of the world. England had been an agricultural country, and there came a time when there was a land question! The enclosure of the commons, as it is called, was one of the supreme tragedies of English life. But with the development of power machinery came the industrialization of the realm. "England's green and pleasant land," to quote William Blake, was now begrimed with the smoke of belching chimneys; her lovely countryside was crossed and recrossed by clanking railways; her cities and even her villages were fetid with reeking slums.

And did the countenance divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic mills?

The answer to these questions was as challenging to the German economist as to the English poet. At the heart of the problem of this new and dreadful age, as Marx saw it, was the factory; and there could be no end of the world's misery, and no escape from its doom, save in the capture and use of the factory by the workers.

III

HENRY GEORGE, *per contra*, was born and reared in a country which was still agricultural. He had seen the farm-lands of the East and the vast prairies of the West. He lived in California, which was the frontier of a nation possessed of boundless territories and receding horizons. Industrialism, to be sure, had begun—in the cotton mills of New England, for example! But still for years was land and its cultivation the central factor of American life. What more natural therefore than for George to read the problem of modern society in terms of land, and to believe that in free land lay the all-sufficient solution of the ills threatening in the phenomenon of a growing wealth and poverty. Just as the factory question, in other words, was dramatized in England in the mid-nineteenth century, so the land question was dramatized in America.

In this contrast of scene and setting, we discover a central contrast between these two men. Marx saw clearly the menace of capitalistic monopoly; George saw as clearly the menace of land monopoly. Marx focused his attention primarily on the factory, and only incidentally and accidentally on the land on which the factory was built and from which it drew its substance;² George focused his attention on the land, and only incidentally and accidentally on the factory which stood upon the land. Marx never penetrated to the land as the ultimate source of all wealth; George did not follow through to the factory, and the whole system of which it was the baleful symbol, as a supplementary and very potent instrument of exploitation. Marx was not fundamental, as George was fundamental. Henry George was really getting down to the bottom of things! But the Single Tax will never reach to the top of things, never compass the whole area of

² [Cp. F. C. R. Douglas, "Karl Marx's Theories of Surplus Value and Land Rent," London, Henry George Foundation, 1939—EDITOR.]

social ill, until it has grappled at first hand not only with land ownership, but with monopoly control of production, finance capitalism, international cartels, and imperialistic wars. Our civilization, as it has developed through a hundred years, is neither agricultural nor industrial; it is both. Therefore must any reform, adequate to save our civilization, solve the problem of land and machine together. There is something more than chance in the dramatic circumstance that in the same age, and in the same way, two books captured the imagination of the American people—Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" (1879), and Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward" (1888).

IV

ANOTHER CONTRAST! Karl Marx was a materialist, and based his whole philosophy upon the hard and fast doctrine of economic determinism, or "the materialistic conception of history." This attitude of mind was in part a reflex from Marx's strangely perverted hostility to religion, and in part also the result of the philosophical materialism which was rampant in the thought of Europe in Marx's formative years. It led to a new interpretation of the historical process which is of the greatest value. No one can write or read the story of mankind in the traditional pre-Marxian sense ever again! But it involved also a complete neglect of the moral and spiritual forces which indubitably play an important, perhaps the decisive rôle in the drama of human events, and thus persuaded Marx to surrender history to the gaunt and grim necessity of a mechanistic fatalism, and to project collapse or revolution as the denouement of our age. It contributed as well to his scorn for men, and his repudiation of democracy as the means of social advance.

Henry George, on the other hand, was a religious man. Reared under the training of a religious family, he preserved

to the end of his days, and in all his activities, an intense and moving religious consciousness. This did not mean any particular devotion to the rites and ceremonies of the church—on the contrary, his attacks upon the church for its failure to vindicate the law of righteousness among men were as vigorous as they were unanswerable. Neither did his religion take any special forms of pietistic practice or theological belief. With George, as with all great prophets, religion was a rule of life and an utter dedication to mankind. It was a recognition of and a reverence for God's will, a resolute determination that this will shall be done upon the earth, and a high sense of responsibility that this determination should not fail. "The religious spirit," writes Dr. Geiger,³ "was to him always the crusading spirit. . . . He led the attack upon the land monopoly in almost the spirit of a holy war; his economic postulates were the sacraments of a religion that was to make all men brothers and God a father whose ways could now be understood." I know of nothing more touching, in all the range of our American literature, than that famous passage in "Progress and Poverty" where George seems to have completed his great argument for the Single Tax. Through hundreds of pages he has made his way through the economics of rent, wages, interest, taxation, and at last has come to his conclusions. "My task is done," he writes. But it is not done! The pen sweeps on. "The thought still mounts. The problems we have been considering lead into a problem higher and deeper still." And George soars, in these last pages, like an aeroplane into the stratosphere, into a discussion of the meaning of life as "absolutely and inevitably bound by death." "Progress and Poverty" is the only treatise on political economy I know which ends with a statement of faith in the immortality of the soul. In this, George found assurance of those "eternal laws" which must at last bring vindication to the cause of truth.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 337.

It was this religious aspect of George's nature which enabled him to bring a solution to the baffling problem of a society which produces poverty in exact ratio to its production of wealth. It cannot be made too plain that Karl Marx, for all his exhaustive and exhausting examination of data and analysis of trends, had no remedy for a sick world. He simply awaited what he regarded as the inevitable catastrophe which must overtake a capitalistic civilization, and tried to prepare the workers to take over the ruins, to become the heirs of chaos, and thus, through seizure of power amid disaster, to control the future in their own interest. Henry George saw no need of catastrophe. He had a remedy for the sickness of this world. He had a program which would save it in time, and thus prevent the calamity of the passing of one more civilization, which he saw as clearly and terribly as his Socialistic rival. What wonder that, when he had written the last page of his masterpiece, "in the dead of night, when (he) was entirely alone, (he) fell on (his) knees and wept like a child. The rest was in the Master's hands." This was a feeling, he wrote, which never left him. "It has been to me a religion, strong and deep."⁴

V

ONE FINAL CONTRAST between these two men—and this not in their characters but their fates!

The Marxian philosophy has had a chance to prove itself. "In the time of the breaking of nations," at the weakest point of the capitalistic-imperialistic system which was Russia, came revolution. The Bolsheviki, devout Marxians, were able at the critical moment in 1917 to seize power, and to use it to rear a Socialistic, or rather a collectivistic society. This society has now been in existence for thirty years, and has exercised supreme control during this period over a nation of 180,000,-

⁴ Henry George, Jr., "The Life of Henry George," New York, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1942, pp. 311-2.

000 souls. It has been able to do exactly what it wanted to, or, if thwarted or opposed, has hacked its way ruthlessly toward its goal. Everything has been changed from Tsarism to Marxism, yet everything remains strangely the same. Poverty still prevails, tyranny still rules, exploitation still is rife. The revolution, as a revolution, has failed—and all for the lack of what Karl Marx never recognized—namely, liberty! The Soviets have sacrificed liberty, we are told, for security—somewhat, perhaps, as the dog on the bridge over the brook dropped his jawful of meat, to grab the other and larger piece of meat he saw reflected in the stream. There is no liberty in the new Russia—and there is no security. For the simple reason that liberty is the only real security! We are safe—as safe as we can be on this uncertain globe, and amid the manias of men!—only while we are free. It is because the Russians are not free that they are the most suspicious, apprehensive, and fearful people in the world today, and have failed thus to win their goal. Marxism has been tried, and for lack of liberty has been found wanting.

Georgism has not been tried. Nor would George want it tried by any imposition of authority. Liberty is essential to its whole meaning. George would free the land that man may himself be truly free. The world awaits therefore not an abrogation, nor even abridgement, but rather an ultimate extension of democracy. No sudden, least of all violent, revolution will accomplish this end; only the slow fulfilment of the truth, like the rising of the tide. Arthur Hugh Clough has pictured the process:

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

I think of the famous saying from "Progress and Poverty"

carved on the stone above Henry George's grave in Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn—

THE TRUTH THAT I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE CLEAR WILL NOT FIND
EASY ACCEPTANCE. IF THAT COULD BE, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
ACCEPTED LONG AGO. IF THAT COULD BE, IT WOULD NEVER
HAVE BEEN OBSCURED. BUT IT WILL FIND FRIENDS—THOSE
WHO TOIL FOR IT, SUFFER FOR IT, IF NEED BE DIE FOR IT. THIS
IS THE POWER OF TRUTH.

New York

The primary rights of man are three: (1) the natural right of a man to himself, which includes the rights of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of action. Without the right to himself, thought, speech and action cannot be used in his own defense nor as aids to his sustenance. (2) The natural right to use the earth, for the reason that he cannot draw food, fuel, clothing, and shelter from any other source. The earth is indispensable to him, as it is to any other animal. (3) The natural right to the product of his labor. These are the three natural rights, and it was not until he lost his right to use the earth, when the State born of conquest and robbery was set up, that he discovered he had lost his right to the full value of his produce.

FRANCIS NEILSON

Free Trade With Canada*

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

IF EVER TWO COUNTRIES were intended to trade together in peace and prosperity without any hindrance whatever, they are Canada and the United States. No neutral barrier separates us, and not a single fortress or warship. We have been garrisoning a Newfoundland harbor and have built and used a string of airfields on Canadian soil, while Canadian uniforms have been familiar sights in our streets and airdromes. We are partners in a Joint Defense Board which is to be permanent; indeed, the whole North American defense problem will hereafter include Canada and the United States as one. Abroad the sons of both countries have died together in closest comradeship before the joint enemy. Not a single untoward incident, no friction, no differences of opinion have marked this co-operation; it has been a partnership between two nations unparalleled in its completeness and mutual trust.

Following the establishment at Ogdensburg in August, 1940, of the permanent Joint Defense Board, the Prime Minister of Canada, Mackenzie King, and President Roosevelt issued a declaration at Hyde Park in 1941 on the mobilization of the economic resources of the two countries in which it was agreed "as a general principle" that "each country should provide the other with the defense articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all produce quickly, and that the production program should be coordinated to this end." In the next year, on November 30, 1942, Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the Canadian Minister to Washington, Leighton McCarthy, exchanged two notes which agreed that "postwar settlements must be such

* Copyright, 1947, by Oswald Garrison Villard. [This paper is a section of a monograph Mr. Villard is completing on international trade.—EDITOR].

as to promote mutually advantageous economic relations" between the two countries. For "the betterment of world-wide economic relations," they undertook for their governments to

co-operate in formulating a program of agreed action, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment and the exchange and the consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

If we can do all of this in war-time, why should there not be the fullest and freest co-operation and exchange of goods and services between the two countries in time of peace? Can this only take place when the sons of the two nations are being killed abroad? This question is the more important because, as Prime Minister King has pointed out, "the trade between Canada and the United States was based upon a community of interest which made North America two nations, but in trade, one community." He stressed the fact that the total trade between the two countries before the second World War was "greater than the total trade between any other two countries on the face of the earth." He could have noted that Canada has now become the third greatest exporting nation in the world. It is not necessary to add anything to this to prove how important to the welfare of the United States is this joint traffic over its Northern boundary.

How the war expanded that trade appears from the fact that whereas Canada purchased \$264,000,000 of American products in 1932, that figure jumped to \$1,424,000,000 in 1943 and was held at \$1,060,000,000 in the peace year of 1946. In 1932 the United States paid \$159,000,000 to Canada for products purchased, but in 1943, excluding all gold purchases, it paid no less than \$1,149,000,000 to Canada for the goods it needed and for the minerals required by our war

needs. It is true, as the Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, James A. MacKinnon, has said, 80 per cent of the war-time Canadian-American trade was temporary, and abnormal war-time business. Nonetheless, the opportunity is ripe for maintaining a larger volume of peace-time trade than ever before. For example, the war trade has shown us how much the two countries would profit if the semi-manufactured products of Canadian metal and power were admitted free of duty into the United States and the finished products went back into Canada just as freely. Even before the war this was being done with such metals as aluminum and nickel and with certain chemicals, but it was not possible to do so with copper products because of the 4-cent-a-pound duty on all copper entering the United States from Canada. It was done to a certain extent with asbestos. The Canadian Government is now working industriously for free trade in all agricultural machines, and this is but one example of the way the business between the two countries could be built up to take the place of the abnormal war traffic.

The war-time agreements between the two countries practically wiped out the tariffs between them. As the Canadian Minister of Finance, James Ilesley, put it in the Canadian House of Commons on June 26, 1944: "For the present the [Canadian] tariff is without any great influence on the scope or direction of external trade." He explained that it had been supplanted under the stress of the war because of the "scarcity of supplies, agreed allocations, bulk purchasing, import and export permits, and import subsidies—these are the instruments which determine, for the time being, the extent and pattern of [our] world trade." Now the most important thing to note is that neither the Congress nor the Ottawa Parliament voted to eliminate the tariffs. They were merely brushed aside by the two governments on the ground that nothing must interfere with their war co-operation.

Just what the arrangements are it has not been easy to ascertain. There is supposed to have been much entering of debits and credits on each nation's books to be ironed out after the war—John MacCormac says that there were bookkeeping transactions between one branch of the government and another. But for the duration there was an unwritten agreement to forget about tariff differences wherever that was possible.

With freedom from tariff bonds has come also temporary freedom from the quotas, import licenses and the numerous other restrictive and discriminatory trade practices which have done so much to increase the tariff evil and to throw obstacles in the way of trade between the two countries. Goods presented at customs houses are too often received, especially upon the American border, as dangerous things, to be handled not as speedily as possible, but as if with the desire to delay their entry by every possible means, by hook or by crook. There have been marking regulations which caused infinite trouble on the Canadian border, and the extraordinarily elaborate and difficult customs documents to be signed by the unfortunate importers and exporters have apparently been planned as if for the express purpose of further making trade as difficult as possible. The "invisible tariffs" have been as vexatious in the trade between these two countries as anywhere else.

Why should any sane person, either in the United States or in Canada, think of renewing such odious shackles now after the war? Mr. King has called for the progressive annual reduction of all tariffs by all nations as soon as peace is restored, and his Parliamentary assistant, Brooke Claxton, has voiced the hope that the United States and Canada will not wait for any international agreement, but will go "further than almost any nations have ever gone or today would be prepared to go" in eliminating tariffs, and in permitting trade to flow

unhindered across their borders. All the Canadian political parties are on record as calling for freer trade, more trade, and the closest economic ties with the United States. Moreover, in February, 1944, a Gallup poll revealed that 70 per cent of the Canadians are in favor of immediate free trade between the two countries. This should surprise no one, for the aid which the United States has given to Canada has helped to open up Canadian resources to an amazing extent, as witness the "Canol" oil undertaking and even the dubious Alaskan Highway. No national pride, no suspicion, no jockeying for advantage, no effort to profit by any emergency, and no selfish interests have intervened.

In view of all this it is hardly surprising that Mackenzie King has also said that

all the available evidence of the state of public opinion in Canada points to the desire of our people to see even better trade relations with the United States, and better relations with the whole world. Canadians of all parties and all classes are coming to see that in the long run we have to import if we are going to export. Our people realize that two-way trade can raise the level of consumption and the standard of living in our country. We recognize that accepting the exports of other lands is the only way to find secure markets for our own surplus productive power. Such a policy is in our own national interest. We believe it is no less in the interest of every other nation.

It would be difficult to find a clearer instance of the blighting effects of nationalism upon the trade relations of two countries than is to be found in this Canadian-American situation. Here again it is solely the difference in the national flag which for generations has impelled the leaders of both countries each to regard the other as a dangerous competitor and to engage in tariff wars. Were Canada to join this country, the most hidebound protectionist in Washington would of course never think of demanding a tariff between the two sections of the United States. As this is not the case, we continue to consider the Canadians primarily as foreigners so that, despite our fundamental kinship with them in ideals

and language, we have done our best to keep the two peoples apart by putting just as many hindrances as possible in the way of our joint trade. At times this protection rivalry has given rise to such bitter feeling as to threaten most serious results. For example, Rudyard Kipling declared on the day when the Canadians rejected a reciprocity treaty with the United States in 1911, that "it is her own soul that Canada risks today."¹ The bitterest antagonists of the treaty in Canada called for "no truck or trade with the Yankees,"—strange reading in the light of the complete comradeship of today. These words were of course echoed on our side of the boundary by politicians more eager to get votes than to bring about tariff union. The treaty would have had a much better chance of acceptance in Canada if it had not been for statements made by William J. Bryan, Champ Clark and others. The annexation bogey was also trotted out and played its part in the defeat of the Laurier reciprocity proposal.

What are the concrete obstacles in the way of American agreement to tariff abolition so far as Canada is concerned, aside from the ingrained protective character of our economic policies? Primarily there is the startling fact that, as one looks at Canada, one discovers that American manufacturers have sought to have their protection cake and to eat it, too. By 1941, they had invested \$4,000,000,000 in Canada, three times as much as in any other country, and as a result they then controlled or owned outright one-fourth of all the manufacturing in Canada. All the great American companies, like General Electric, Westinghouse, General Motors, Ford, Bell Telephone, the Aluminum Company of America, and numerous others are represented by branch plants on the other side of the boundary. Henry Ford once said to the

¹ Mr. Kipling deliberately overlooked the Reciprocity Treaty which existed between the United States and Canada in the year 1854 as a result of which the total trade between the two countries rose from \$35,000,000 to \$57,000,000 in 1856. It expired in 1866, apparently leaving Canada's soul untainted.

present writer: "If the tariff bothers you in any country, well, you just go into it and build your own factory and there you are. I have factories and assembly plants in Canada, England, Germany, Spain and many other countries. Their tariffs and quotas do not hurt me there." Thus he was quite willing that our tariffs should hurt the foreigner, but was wholly unready to swallow the tariff medicine when it was offered by foreigners.

No less than 1,200 American manufacturers have, however, adopted this Ford philosophy and established Canadian branches. As far back as 1934 there were 690 firms, with a capitalization of \$545,692,000, employed in straight manufacturing, while 115 made the pulp and paper our printing industry has relied upon because of the exhaustion of our own pulpwood forests. And there were 49 firms engaged in mining and smelting, while 81 other American enterprises were in the category of public utilities. By 1938 American-owned companies made 82 per cent of all the trucks and automobiles manufactured in Canada, 68 per cent of the electrical apparatus, 44 per cent of non-metallic mineral manufactures, 41 per cent of chemicals, 42 per cent of agricultural, industrial and office machinery, and 40 per cent of miscellaneous manufactures. Undoubtedly these figures have been considerably altered in our favor by the war developments.

It is a curious fact that these American businesses in Canada profit by the imperial preference system, first adopted by Canada in 1897 and extended and increased several times between then and 1932 for the express purpose, among others, of enabling Canada to find other trade outlets since she was so considerably excluded from the American market. It was also due, of course, to the desire of other British possessions, like the British West Indies, to obtain Canadian markets for their products. It was not so much a purpose to shut out American and other foreign goods, some people insist, as a

wish to obtain increased trade with other nations. But the upshot was that the Americans in Canada have been benefitting by this very device to increase trade between the Dominions and other parts of the Empire!

Another obstacle to free trade between the two countries will undoubtedly be some American farmers, for Canada until the war has been largely an agrarian country and our farmers, particularly those along the border, have been very much afraid of Canadian competition—again something that they would not be concerned with if both countries were under the same flag. Here is where American leadership will have to play its part and set forth not only the economic truth, but tell of the damage done to the American farmers by tariffs, and to point the way to co-operation under the new international arrangements for provisioning the world, for the disposal of the surpluses both of our countries and the other great agrarian nations. Undoubtedly the American bankers, who have for years now been protesting against the tariffs, can be counted on to throw their weight behind the proposed reciprocity treaty and the goal beyond that. Behind these forces will stand the irreconcilable American protectionists who will not yield one inch without protest in their determination to hold on to their special privileges, their partnership with the government in Washington for the maintenance of their profits. They will be strengthened by the Republican control of the new Congress.

It will be a misfortune, indeed, if the present golden opportunity for bringing the two countries together were to be lost. If the United States refuses to respond, then Canada will perforce be pushed into closer and closer relations with England and with other countries to our hurt. As Mr. Ilesley has said, for Canada "world trade is the very bloodstream" and it will not be deterred by any American shortsightedness from getting that trade elsewhere if it cannot do all the busi-

ness it desires with its immediate neighbor. Meanwhile the Canadian Government has given further proof of its desire to co-operate with us. Thus, in June, 1944, Parliament rescinded the War Exchange Conservation Act which had set up special war-time prohibitions or restrictions on the import of non-essential merchandise from hard-currency countries. The only restrictions now are those pertaining to the rationing of scarce materials, and these are arrived at usually by conferences between representatives of the two countries. Again, the 10 per cent War Exchange Tax voted in 1940 as an additional source of revenue, and in order to restrict purchases from hard-currency countries, has been cancelled by an "Order in Council" as to many of the items though not all of those affected. This certainly would seem to indicate that Canada will not hold to war restrictions in trade matters a minute longer than absolutely necessary. Hence, in discussing tariff relations between the two countries in the future, we need only think of normal rates and regulations.

In the spring of 1945 the Canadian Government announced its postwar policies as follows: It will do its utmost to build up the exporting capacity of other nations so that Canada may ultimately receive payment in imports for its exports and it will work hard to obtain from other countries "zealous collaboration on broad lines for the reciprocal reduction and removal of trade barriers." It aims to export \$1,750,000,000 worth of goods annually—a 50 per cent decrease from its war-time top mark, and a 60 per cent increase in dollar value above the export level maintained before the war. It is especially noteworthy that it looks to this international interchange of goods as "the greatest dynamic force influencing the level of national income and employment in Canada." To further it the government will reduce certain taxes and will follow a fiscal policy planned to stimulate private capi-

tal investments.² This was reaffirmed by James A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce, before the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in London, who declared, on January 22, 1946, that the present Canadian Government is now promoting imports as its predecessors sought to increase exports. This policy is strongly upheld by Canadian industrialists like R. C. Stanley, Chairman of the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd., who has urged the reducing of exchange restrictions, and "eliminating unnecessary tariffs and governmental trade barriers," while the Canadian Importers and Traders Association has issued a brief in which it declares that "one-way trade and bilateral agreements which brought the world to the present cataclysm *must* be a thing of the past," and demands that Canada take the lead in removing "as rapidly as possible" all impediments to trade between Canada and every nation desiring to do business with it.

Americans must realize that they are no longer dealing with a small and insignificant Dominion, but that, as MacKenzie King has put it, "in the course of the present war we have seen Canada emerge from nationhood into a position generally recognized as that of a world power." Canada has certainly achieved enough since 1939, and given us such outstanding aid, as to be able to demand the fullest equality of consideration. The Dominion has not even accepted lend-lease aid from us, but has paid us for all war materials or manufactured articles imported from the United States for the use of its military or naval forces, while raw materials bought from us by Canada for use in making armaments for England were debited to England under lend-lease. In these war relationships Canada's aim has been the mutual benefit of both countries without any selfish purpose or any objective that it was not willing to share with us or any other country.

² *Monthly Trade Review* of the Bank of Montreal, May, 1945.

If the Dominion is now met with similar evidences of American good-will and the desire to make our postwar relations as close as those between the individual American States, and not in a horse-trading spirit, not only will the two countries profit, but the whole world.

New York

Justice is from the beginning and is not a mere legal term as it is understood by men today. Justice is indeed so closely inter-linked with the conception of natural law that it is impossible to dissociate the two. My own definition of it is: "Justice is the law of Providence inherent in nature." It comes from the Creator; indeed, creation itself is unthinkable without it. It determines the natural right of man to use the source of his well-being. Those who scorn the idea of natural law or natural right do not realize when they do so that, at the same time, they deny justice. Many are guilty of this through ignorance, but how many in repudiating natural law and justice do so for the sole purpose of legalizing ill-gotten gains?

FRANCIS NEILSON

Evaluating the Potsdam Plan

By FERDINAND A. HERMENS

WHEN THE POTSDAM DECLARATIONS on the future of Germany were announced, *The Economist* concluded its leading editorial on the subject with these words:

Above all, it (the Potsdam plan) has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the post-war world. At the end of a mighty war fought to defeat Hitlerism, the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace. This is the real measure of their failure.¹

The indictment is severe, but those who have given attention to the matter will be aware of the fact that not a few economists, both in this country and in England, concur in it. Definite support for the Potsdam plan has come, as a rule, only from those who had a share in the development of this policy, such as Henry Morgenthau, Jr.,² and the Foreign Economic Administration (FEA),³ whose views were largely discounted.

A detailed defense of the Potsdam declarations by outside observers, however, was presented in a study entitled "The Economic Problem of Germany." Prepared under the auspices of the Institute of World Affairs, and widely distributed by it in reprint form (after publication in the June 1946 issue of *Social Research*), it gains added importance by reason of the fact that it lists Dr. Alvin Johnson as its author together

¹ "The German Settlement," *The Economist*, Aug. 11, 1945.

² "Germany Is Our Problem," New York 1945. What had to be said about this book, was said effectively by Dr. N. Jasny ("25,000,000 Germans Too Many," *The New Leader*, Nov. 3, 1945), and Dr. Guenther Reiman, (*Commentary*, *A Jewish Review*, January, 1945).

³ "A Program for German Economic and Industrial Disarmament, A Study Submitted by the Foreign Economic Administration (Enemy Branch) to the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate," April, 1946. This study is important because it claims that the major details as well as the general principles of the Potsdam declarations are due to American initiative. Even where it is generally assumed that measures finally adopted represent a compromise between Russian and English views, such as in regard to the steel production permitted, it will be seen that the proposals of the FEA prevailed almost completely; see pp. 139-40.

with Dr. Ernest Hamburger.⁴ If we want to examine the case for Potsdam in its stronger guise, this can best be done by an analysis of the paper by Hamburger and Johnson.

I

A CRITICAL EVALUATION of "The Economic Problem of Germany" has to begin with its title. Economic considerations were secondary to the men who planned the Potsdam declarations. This had to be the case. When we analyze a national problem from the economic point of view, we look for ways to maximize the economic opportunities of a particular country, or of a group of countries. Whereas it is practically correct to say that the purpose of the Potsdam plan is to minimize the economic opportunities of Germany, without much attention being paid to the negative effects which such a policy was bound to entail for other countries. Those who had a share in preparing the Potsdam declarations are quite explicit on what held top priority among their considerations. In the words of the FEA, "security from German aggression should be the primary United States objective in the treatment of Germany."⁵ This writer found that when he drew attention to the economic drawbacks of the Potsdam plan, his critics invariably objected that possible economic losses had to be accepted, and that they mattered little when compared with the advantages to be gained with respect to security.

Security is a political goal, however. When looking for ways by which to reach it, few would turn to economic measures exclusively. Numerous political questions arise in any discussion of the matter, in particular if the problem is limited

⁴ Dr. Johnson limits the extent of his contribution as follows: "This study . . . is mainly the work of Dr. Ernest Hamburger, who has assembled the data and has drawn them together into a meaningful form. My share in the work has been mainly that of a faithful critic, who has weighed every statement and made sure of its substantial validity" (*Loc. cit.*, p. 135). Dr. Johnson's article on "Two Sides of the German Problem," in the Autumn, 1946, issue of *The Yale Review*, while starting with premises similar to those of "The Economic Problem of Germany," concludes by declaring, in unambiguous terms, that the limitation of German industry (the essence of the Potsdam plan) is unnecessary.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 52. See also pp. 335-6.

to any one country, a procedure which is as apt to create artificial problems as it is to obscure the real problems and the means to their solution. For reasons of space the general framework within which the problem of security from Germany should be discussed cannot be taken up here; I have dealt with it on another occasion.⁶ Even if, however, we limit our attention to the economic aspects of security, the conclusions which the economist will reach are certain to differ sharply from those accepted—or rather, treated as axiomatic—at Potsdam. All we have to bear in mind is that the economy of a country like Germany cannot serve as a war economy as long as it is left to its natural tendencies.

The German economy could become a war economy only after autarchy had been promoted by a number of measures: a protective tariff which increased the production of steel and of food; the extensive (and expensive) production of substitutes, and, finally, the accumulation of stockpiles. Recently, Professor Bonn re-emphasized, vigorously and brilliantly, that "The German war potential, before and after the advent of the Nazis, was extremely brittle."⁷ This war potential will be destroyed entirely if we rescind, and forbid, all measures by which autarchy was promoted. In that case the German economy would depend upon the economy of the rest of the world, and in particular upon the economy of western and northern Europe; it could move by itself no more than an automobile could move with no rubber on the wheels and with its gas tank empty.

The measures I propose would undoubtedly be adopted if the goal were to transform the German economy into what truly could be called a "peace economy." But when the Potsdam declarations use that term, they do so for the purpose

⁶ "The Potsdam Policies," *Forum*, February, 1946; "Potsdam or Peace: The Choice Before Us," *Human Events Pamphlet* for December, 1946.

⁷ M. J. Bonn, "The Economics of Fear," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July, 1946, p. 133.

of concealing an intention of destroying as large a part of the German economy as possible. It might be recalled that in the words of so careful an observer as Francis Neilson, "It (the text of the Potsdam declarations) so nearly approaches the Morgenthau scheme of dealing with Germany that the minor differences here and there are of little consequence."⁸ This, of course, is also the opinion of Mr. Morgenthau.

II

SECURITY IS ONLY THE FIRST of several declared purposes of the Potsdam plan. The second goal is to be: "To convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat, and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves, since their own ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed the German economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable." This sentence lacks logic; the restrictions imposed upon German industry were *not* due to "ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance," and they were bound to produce a measure of "chaos and misery" of their own. It is intended to justify this addition by proclaiming the collective guilt of the people of Germany, which then serves as the basis of collective punishment.

The most characteristic feature of this punishment is the stipulation that such productive capacity as is left to Germany, after having served the needs of the occupying powers and the displaced persons, should be used to "maintain in Germany average living standards not exceeding the average of the standards of living of European countries." Subsequently this was interpreted to mean a living standard corresponding to that of 1932, the worst year of the depression. This provision is purely negative; it bestows no benefits upon anybody. The seventy million persons to whom this rule ap-

⁸ "The Tragedy of Europe," Vol. V, Appleton, Wis., C. C. Nelson Publishing Co., 1946, p. 480.

plies are punished because they were German or, in the case of some of the minorities to be expelled into rump-Germany, because their ancestors were German centuries ago. While Goering and his associates had an opportunity to defend themselves in Nuremberg, the people subjected to this limitation of economic opportunity were condemned without trial. Punishment extends to children born after Hitler's death, whom few would hold responsible for what happened under his rule.

In a document dominated by the desire to establish "security" in a very negative form, and to inflict collective punishment, there is little room for economic considerations. It can always be argued that if there is an economic decline beyond the point anticipated, it will provide added security, and serve as further punishment. It should be remembered that the rule governing the German standard of living establishes a ceiling, not a floor, and that Mr. Morgenthau and his followers—some of whom had considerable influence upon the military government of Germany—insisted from the outset that the economic consequences of the curtailment of German economic activity were no concern of the occupying powers. Still, it might be held that there is an economic problem in so far as the actual extent of the consequences of the curtailment of German industrial activity is concerned. Messrs. Hamburger and Johnson ask themselves the specific question whether there is a prospect that, under the new dispensation, the people of Germany can survive without outside assistance. Their answer is in the affirmative, provided that certain assumptions can be made.

It is interesting to note, however, that the greatest obstacle which stands in the way of optimistic conclusions in regard to the future of Germany under Potsdam, is not considered by the authors of the study under review. *The Economist*, in its comments on the "Level of Industry Plan," used rather strong words:

It is a naive illusion—an illusion which betrays an extraordinary ignorance of the dynamics of modern industry—to believe that a highly industrialized country like Germany can be compelled to stabilize its industrial activity on some wantonly chosen low level, and then remain on that level for any length of time. The result of such restrictionist operations is almost certain to be a decline even below the modest level of industry that has been allowed Germany under the plan. . . .⁹

What *The Economist* expressed in popular terms, is taken up by the student of economics¹⁰ when he learns about "the method of variation." He is then taught that we cannot always assume that a particular change in the "data" will produce counteracting changes, with the result that equilibrium is restored. Such a result may be expected when the change is small—so small, that the assumption "other things being equal," which is understood even when it is not stated, remains valid. When changes in data are great, nothing can be predicted except that we must anticipate changes in many directions, which, if they are negative, may aggravate rather than offset one another. John Maynard Keynes, among others, has emphasized that instead of a tendency favoring the establishment of a new equilibrium, there may develop a cumulative downward process. The changes imposed upon the German economy in Potsdam are not only large, but they are in a number of respects detrimental to the very basis of economic activity, and a cumulative downward process was to be expected. It took less than a year to see that the symptoms of such a process were present. General McNarney, in his report for February, referred to the "basically adverse situation" existing in the American zone, and added that "low morale and uncertainty about the future are now major

⁹ Cf. "The German Crisis," a symposium of five articles published in the issue of April 6, 1946. These articles cover a number of points which cannot be treated here.

¹⁰ In this connection it becomes relevant that the academic background of Dr. Hamburger, and of Henry H. Fowler (the director of the Enemy Branch of the FEA, who directed the latter's work on German industrial disarmament) is in the field of law rather than of economics.

hindrances to all economic activity."¹¹ The British parliamentary committee which visited Germany in the summer of 1946 said, in regard to coal: "Your Committee stress the seriousness of the position and would emphasize that in the absence of remedial measures things will get worse and not better."¹² The context makes it plain that the authors would have been willing to say the same for the entire German economy.

III

AMONG THE FACTORS producing a cumulative downward process in Germany are the disproportionalities in the production quotas fixed by the Control Council. While the general level of industrial activity is supposed to reach 50 to 55 per cent of the pre-war figure, the quotas for certain key industries have been set so much lower that they tend to drag the rest down with them. At a time when there is a serious bottleneck in transportation—not only in Germany, but also in the liberated countries, including Russia—the production of new locomotives before 1949 is prohibited. This limitation is aggravated by the fact that only 40,000 passenger cars, including busses, may be produced annually, which compares with a pre-war figure six times that high. Then there is the limitation of machine tool production to 11.4 per cent of the pre-war output, with the production of certain types of machine tools being prohibited entirely. Nobody has shown as yet how it is possible, at such a level, to keep the existing machines in operation, and to provide for expansion where expansion is supposed to be desirable.

¹¹ "Monthly Report of the Military Governor, U. S. Zone, 20 March 1946," p. 44. McNarney attributes the blame primarily to the lack of interzonal trade, which is contrary to the Potsdam agreement. Hamburger and Johnson, likewise, make it clear that Germany has to be treated as an economic unit if the Potsdam program is to work. The artificial division into zones was indeed a very negative factor, but while it aggravated existing difficulties, it did not create them. It will be interesting to watch the economic results of the unification of the American and British zones. Experts on the spot are warning against expecting too much.

¹² "The Control Office for Germany and Austria (Expenditure in Germany)," report, ordered printed 23 July 1946, p. 11.

Among the specific limitations, that of steel is particularly important because the level of other industries has been planned on its basis. The maximum annual steel production is 5.8 million tons; the capacity is fixed at 7.5 million tons, with only the older equipment to be left in Germany. In "The Economic Problem of Germany" the proposed figure is approved with the modification that 6.5 million tons annually might be necessary and that, for a number of years, an additional 2 million tons be allowed for reconstruction purposes. Reference is made to the fact that the average German steel consumption, from 1925 to 1929, was between 11 and 12 million tons. Messrs. Hamburger and Johnson assume first that steel consumption originating in industries now forbidden or restricted can be eliminated. Then they deduct a million tons for the territory east of the Oder and Neisse rivers, although the people who lived in those territories are to be transferred into the rest of Germany where, if they are to survive, new houses and new factories will have to be built for them. It is further assumed that two million tons of steel consumption in the Germany of the late twenties represented extraordinary demand due to investments postponed previously. Such an assumption would have been impossible had attention been paid to the trend of steel consumption in industrial countries, which is continuously upward. In the United States, for example, steel production (taking, for the sake of convenience, the figures of production rather than of consumption) rose from 31.30 million tons in 1913 to 56.43 million tons in 1929, the 1925-29 average being somewhat above 49 million tons. To deduct one-sixth from this figure because production was held to have been "inflated," and freeze American production (and consumption) at that level, would have kept it down to about 50 per cent of the present figure of 80 million tons a year—which would have been a rather effective way of producing stagnation and decay

throughout American industry. German steel production is to be reduced to one-half of the production of twenty years ago, a plan which, if applied to this country, would leave us little more than 30 per cent of our present rate. One cannot but agree with *The Economist* that under such conditions the permission granted to Germany to expand the production of consumer-goods industries is "little less than a mockery."

The contribution to a cumulative downward trend made by specific limitations is supplemented by their psychological results. In the words of the British parliamentary committee:

The citizen of Hamburg, where employment has centered on the port, sees gantries being blown and docks dismantled; the inhabitant of Essen, where employment has centered on Krupps, witnesses rolling mills being dismantled and the manufacture of railway engines, for which the whole of Europe is crying out, prohibited. And neither has any idea what is to take the place of what he sees being destroyed, although there are very promising plans for handing over parts of the Krupp works to other firms, if they are allowed to be put into operation.

The authors say that these conditions, coupled with the bad food and housing situation, "must induce in the German a certain feeling of despair."¹³ Vigorous economic activity does not grow on such a ground.

Morale is also affected by the inflationary condition of the country. Dr. R. W. Lindholm, in his informative article on "Debt and Democracy in Germany"¹⁴ gives us the figures of the existing debt which show that the situation was bound to be bad under the best of circumstances. In the face of so much accumulated purchasing power, the essential condition for the success of any remedy is increased production. Instead, production is being crippled. Besides, not all of the officials concerned with these matters approach them with the intention of securing the best possible economic solution.

¹³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 15.

¹⁴ *AM. JOUR. ECON. SOCIO.*, 6 (October, 1946), 1, pp. 87-93.

The financial section of the military government was, in its formative period, headed by Bernard Bernstein, whom many consider one of the authors of the Morgenthau plan. *The Chicago Sun* of August 9, 1945, published a dispatch by Edd Johnson, under the headline "U. S. Problem is to Squeeze, But Not to Break Germany; Degree of Solvency is Called Inseparable From War-Making Power in the Future." Much of the story consisted of a summary of an interview with Mr. Bernstein, who made it clear that his aim was a limited degree of financial insolvency for Germany. Few would believe that any such limitation could be maintained—permanent insolvency means bankruptcy and is certainly not a basis upon which confidence in a currency can be created and industrial activity encouraged. Be that as it may, as long as the present gap between purchasing power and production continues, it disturbs the economic picture. The farmers, who alone come reasonably close to pre-war production, are reluctant to surrender their surpluses in exchange for worthless paper money. The few industrialists who have stocks and are allowed to use them fear to do so because they cannot replenish them with the money they obtain for their products. Coal miners, who can buy for a day's wage the rationed goods available, do not know why they should work all week; they prefer to take time off to scour the countryside for food for their families, or to hunt for lost relatives.

IV

DIFFICULTIES ARISE also from the bureaucratic supervision which is a necessary part of the Level of Industry Plan, and which is so much more productive in "*Fragebogen*" than in economic results. Besides, this bureaucracy, which is subject to political pressure, is the place where the desire to hold down German competitors can easily find leverage. In Bernard Baruch's memorandum of March 18, 1945, which had great influence upon subsequent official policy, the desire to elimi-

nate German and Japanese "sweated competition" was admittedly a major objective, alongside the desire to promote "security." *The Economist's* scathing denunciation (in its issue of June 9th it called Mr. Baruch's plan "immoral, uneconomic, and unworkable") had its effects, and the State Department repudiated any intention of destroying commercial competition. Whenever the industry of one country is regulated by people from another country, however, there will be so many temptations to sin that virtue will find it hard to survive. One may ask, indeed, why, if not to suppress competition, the Potsdam plan decreed the abolition of the German merchant marine, and why the Level of Industry Plan ordered a reduction of the output in light electrical engineering to 50 per cent of the pre-war figure. In "The Economic Problem of Germany" it is stated that under certain assumptions the unrestricted German industries might produce 1,734 million marks worth of exports. The text continues: "This may appear feasible, but it should be regarded as the maximum if a flooding and consequent disintegration of foreign markets by German exports is to be prevented" (p. 174).

Other factors make their contribution to a cumulative downward trend. There is, in particular, the way in which de-nazification, demilitarization and decartelization are handled; if a systematic war against management and competent technical personnel was intended it could hardly have been conducted differently from the way these things are being done. Why does not the State Department make public the list of the 134 categories of Germans, including the members of fifty organizations, who are subject to "denazification"? Some people on this side of the Atlantic would get a shock, and some officials in Germany the "pink slip," which they have deserved so long. The members of the British parliamentary commission clearly indicate that they were disturbed by what they saw being done under the heading of

"denazification." In their words: "No man, for instance, who has been a Nazi, can in 1946 be a technician in a mine, whereas, in 1945, no man could be a technician in a mine unless he was a Nazi."¹⁵ Is there a better way of sabotaging production?

Many more details could be considered, as, for example, the balance of trade envisaged by the FEA and by the authors of "The Economic Problem of Germany," in which the prohibitions are the only thing that is real, and the positive entries hypothetical. Or the desire to promote a democratic Germany (objective No. 3 of the Potsdam declarations), expressed alongside the provisions which make it all but impossible for the majority of the supporters of democracy who reside in the urban areas to earn a living.¹⁶ Or we might consider the fact that while the object of reparations should be to repair, the Potsdam declarations speak of "reparations" (objective No. 4) in spite of the fact that their principal purpose is to destroy¹⁷—to destroy what is conceived as the basis of potential aggression, but to destroy all the same. An economy subjected to such treatment is not likely to enjoy a "European Living Standard." It is more likely to do what it has done: to become a "Belsen Without Barbed Wire."¹⁸

There would seem to exist a special interest in these developments for those of us who signed petitions to Congress in favor of the Bretton Woods declaration, of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and of the British Loan. Is not the gain to be derived from these measures in

¹⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 15. People who are forced to join a political group in order to retain their jobs are, in their majority, likely to be indifferent, if not hostile, to the convictions which it is attempted to force upon them. To punish them as if they all were Nazis is, of course, the surest way to make them Nazis.

¹⁶ In the words of Professor Bonn: "The irresponsibility of social planners has never been more in evidence than in this scheme for making the world safe for democracy by destroying its economic foundations." *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

¹⁷ For some details see my article, "The Economics of Potsdam," *The Review of Politics*, July 1946, pp. 386-96.

¹⁸ See the two articles by Alexander Clifford in the (London) *Daily Mail*, July 22 and 23, 1946, where conditions in the British zone of occupation are described.

regard to foreign trade and to monetary stability likely to be outweighed by the negative effects of the economy of artificial scarcity forced upon Germany (and, to a lesser extent, upon Japan)? To take but one example, are not the British in danger of having to pour more cash into the "subsidized economic slum" that is Germany than they are likely to draw from the American loan? Should not we all (as Dr. Johnson has, in effect, done in his article for *The Yale Review*) repeat what Professor Frank Notestein of Princeton University said two years ago, namely that "What Europe needs, is more production, not more poverty"?

University of Notre Dame

If we keep constantly in mind the true democracy of old and know how it passed away, we shall have little difficulty in deciding the nature of the reform we should undertake. Keep also this important fact in mind: that the English people have experienced pretty nearly all forms of government. Since the Norman conquest they have known all kinds of rulers. No people has such a history, and yet in all their greatest struggles they have asked for nothing new. Stephen Langton, Simon de Montfort, Sir Thomas More, Pym, Hampden, Cobbett, and Cobden, and many others, are names which mark only a few of the periods in English history when the people asked for their old liberty to be restored.

FRANCIS NEILSON

The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York

A Modern Plan for Medical Care

By ALBERT PLEYDELL

I

DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS, medical science all over the world has made many significant advances. The antibiotics, benadryl, penicillin and nerve surgery are just a few of the better known ones but, in every field of medicine, research is progressing. Both government and privately financed investigations are being carried on and new ideas in medicine are opening up whole fields of inquiry.

Unfortunately, there is a serious time lag between successful research and widespread application. Adequate hospital and clinical facilities are not everywhere available to physicians, and too few medical practitioners are able to keep up with the vast flow of medical literature. Since few physicians can afford complete installations of modern diagnostic instruments, such as the electro-cardiograph, basal metabolism machines, and x-rays, the general practitioner must more and more refer his patients to specialists.

Thus as medical science progresses, and there is more medical knowledge to disseminate, it becomes increasingly difficult to distribute it. The advances of science are of little value if the benefits of progress are not readily available to the public.

The public is ready for change in the distribution of medical care. The very same businessmen and editors who resist economic and political experimentation are prepared to accept new techniques for the distribution of medical care. Even

organized medicine, which traditionally has resisted any change from the fee-for-service technique, today recognizes it is fighting a rear-guard action.

The United States is one of the few countries which has not publicly recognized a responsibility for the medical care of its people. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill, which would reorganize our social security system to include medical benefits, has twice been introduced into Congress, twice had the support of the national administration under both Roosevelt and Truman, twice met the opposition of organized medicine and died in committee. It seems clear the United States is not prepared for a system of tax-supported medicine. Perhaps new methods of distributing medical care on a voluntary basis may be the answer.

Organized medicine has sought to build a system of voluntary medical indemnity insurance operated through State societies in various parts of the country. Although these voluntary prepayment plans have not been whole-heartedly accepted or promoted by the medical profession, they provide some indication of how far organized medicine is prepared to go in improving the distribution of medical care. A typical medical society program is United Medical Service, Inc., which operates in New York as a non-profit medical expense indemnity corporation. It is a limited plan which sets forth certain services to be rendered by physicians at stated fees payable by the insurance company. The doctors who take part in the plan have agreed to provide all of the stipulated services at no extra charge for single persons earning up to \$1800 per year and for married persons with families earning up to \$2500 per year. If the insured earns more than \$1800 or \$2500 per year, as the case may be, the physician may charge a higher scale of fees, the patient being required to pay the difference between the fee charged and the stipulated fee set forth in the UMS contract.

The newest development in the distribution of medical care is the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, which recently was awarded a contract by the City of New York under which the city agreed to pay 50 per cent of the cost of medical care for all of its employees who voluntarily subscribe.

II

HIP, AS THE NEW PLAN is familiarly known, offers comprehensive—unlimited—medical care on a prepaid basis through medical groups. *Time Magazine* has referred to the plan as the "Womb to Tomb" program. It differs in several essentials from ordinary indemnity insurance plans, where provision is made to pay a part of the physician's bill. With only minor exceptions, every type of medical care is provided. The sole exceptions are drug addiction; chronic alcoholism; and purely cosmetic surgery. Complete medical service is available at the home, in the doctor's office or in the hospital. Emphasis is placed upon preventive care. Every subscriber is entitled to regular physical examinations. Prenatal, maternity and post-natal services are provided. There are no waiting periods. No physical examination is required to join and pre-existing conditions are covered. There is no age limitation. Service is available to employed persons earning up to \$5,000 per year.

HIP has studied the problem of the people's medical needs and planned to handle them. This comprehensive system is made possible by the organization of physicians into medical groups which contract with HIP to provide comprehensive medical service to the subscribers who enroll with them. The groups are paid on a so-called "capitation" basis, so much for each patient well or sick. It is thus to the physicians' advantage to keep the patients well and the medical practitioners, if they take care of a large enough group, are assured of fair annual incomes.

HIP is a community plan designed to maintain in every section of Greater New York a balanced medical group of general practitioners and specialists to serve the people who live in the area. The employee subscribes with a group of fellow workers at his place of employment, but service is rendered near his home. In order to make a comprehensive program feasible, it is naturally necessary to base the program upon sound actuarial principles and to have the contracts and coverage in accordance with the New York State insurance law. The services of HIP are available at this time only through employee groups. Each group of subscribers must consist of a minimum of 25 persons and at least 75 per cent of a natural work group. To bring this program to the largest number of persons, HIP requires employers to contribute at least one half of the premiums for their employees and their employees' families. Students of insurance and medical care have pointed out that without the capitation system, in which the doctor is paid to take care of a group of patients and keep them well, such a comprehensive program could not be offered.

Under the New York State law, any group of physicians may organize to provide group medical service. HIP has established certain standards for group practice which each medical group under contract with it must meet. It has also set up a Medical Control Board composed of outstanding physicians to be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of professional standards of the medical groups. The Medical Control Board evaluates critically each medical group's application and also hears grievances, if any, involving medical questions. The existence of HIP, as a central agency to obtain subscribers, has provided the main impetus to medical group organization.

Each subscriber selects a convenient group and from this group selects a general practitioner who is in charge of his and

his family's health. This general physician is a family doctor in the traditional sense, for HIP believes that the family doctor-patient relationship is essential to truly effective medical care. The family doctor assumes charge of the health of the family, knows the family's problems and keeps the medical records.

Working with the family doctor in his medical group is a balanced roster of specialists, and the general physician is encouraged to call upon his associated specialists whenever necessary. The present minimum standards applicable to HIP medical groups require that, in each group, qualified physicians be available to insured persons in the following basic specialties: Internal Medicine, General Surgery, Obstetrics-Gynecology, Pediatrics, Otolaryngology, Ophthalmology, Urology, Orthopedics, Dermatology, Neuro-Psychiatry, Roentgenology and Pathology. In addition the medical groups have been urged by HIP to have their personnel qualify in such subspecialties as the following:

- a. *Medicine*: allergy, cardiology, diseases of the chest, gastro-enterology, endocrinology, metabolism, physical medicine, industrial diseases, venereal diseases.
- b. *Surgery*: proctology, vascular surgery, thoracic surgery, neuro-surgery, plastic surgery.

In any event, each medical group must guarantee to HIP that it will arrange for and provide, whenever required, the service in any specialty and subspecialty in accordance with HIP's agreement to provide comprehensive medical care.

III

TO MANY STUDENTS of medical economics, the successful organization of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York seems the achievement of an age-old dream. Actually

it represents a mighty effort made by men of singular devotion to the public welfare who realized that no cause can succeed without sound planning, careful organization and effective public relationships.

The plan was launched by former Mayor LaGuardia of New York who, out of a lifetime of human sympathy for the people, recognized that a great social void existed in the distribution of good medical care. But Mayor LaGuardia realized that a medical care distribution plan could only succeed if it had the best kind of backing. Accordingly, he called upon a group of New York community leaders in the fields of medicine, business, labor, social welfare and government to join together and launch a non-profit membership corporation to provide medical service. As incorporators, he enlisted such business leaders as Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman, board of directors, Chase National Bank; Mary E. Dillon, president, Brooklyn Borough Gas Co.; Walter S. Mack, Jr., president, Pepsi-Cola Co.; Charles F. Noyes, chairman, board of directors, C. F. Noyes Co.; Rudolph J. Schaefer, president, Schaefer Brewing Co.

From public life, he enlisted the late Alfred E. Smith and Wendell Willkie. The late Sidney Hillman and Matthew Woll were among the top labor leaders to join in the movement.

From social welfare came Lester B. Granger, executive secretary of the National Urban League; Evans Clark, executive director, Twentieth Century Fund; Neva R. Deardoff, assistant director, the Welfare Council of New York. Among the representatives of the medical profession he called upon Dr. George Baehr, president, the Academy of Medicine; Dr. Willard Rappleye, Dean, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; Dr. John Wittmer, vice president, Consolidated Edison Company.

All in all, eighty men and women of good will joined to

form the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. They were big enough to be able to ignore any opposition which might develop, to see the important issues involved and take the necessary steps to make health insurance a reality.

Merely organizing a non-profit corporation as a community enterprise was not sufficient. The work required a competent staff: research, actuarial studies, lawyers to draw contracts, doctors to enlist other doctors and to establish medical standards and procedures.

Fortunately, New York has men and women of wealth and understanding who are prepared to back up their sympathies with their dollars. A prime mover was David M. Heyman, an investment banker who is also president of the New York Foundation. The New York Foundation subscribed nearly two hundred thousand dollars to finance the organization of HIP and, later, the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation made additional funds available to HIP. They reasoned that, properly spent, their philanthropic investment would multiply in benefits as it set in motion the capacity of the people to solve their own problems through sound organization.

Two years of intensive work went into the organization of HIP, into developing actuarial studies, subscriber and medical group contracts, into determining what kind of service was required and how it should be distributed.

From among the incorporators was chosen a board of directors completely representative of New York's major groupings. Experience has demonstrated that on matters of medical care and distribution all elements can co-operate in harmony. Saul Mills, Congress of Industrial Organizations secretary in New York, and James Quinn, who holds a similar post in the American Federation of Labor, see alike when it comes to medical care, and the labor leaders manage to work harmoniously with the leaders of business and finance.

As medical director of HIP, the board of directors selected

Dr. Dean A. Clark, formerly senior surgeon of the United States Public Health Service. Perhaps more than any other man, Dr. Clark has studied group medical care all over the world. A former Rhodes Scholar, he has written extensively in the field of medical care distribution.

IV

HOW DOES ORGANIZED MEDICINE react to HIP? The answer to this question lies more in how HIP has acted toward organized medicine. HIP has run counter to many traditional ideas about the distribution of medical care. To many physicians the concept of prepaid group practice on a "pay the doctor to keep you well" basis is a shock. To overcome this shock, HIP has at all times acted in a friendly, open manner toward the medical profession. Medical questions have been dealt with solely by qualified medical men. The standards of medical care were set so high that there could be no professional objection to them.

With each forward step of the program in any way affecting the medical profession, HIP has taken pains to consult with organized medical groups. The attitude of HIP has been that HIP and its subscribers need the physicians and that everything possible must be done to protect the doctors' interest and satisfy his professional requirements. On this basis it is clear that while HIP goes far beyond the program that organized medicine itself has been prepared to initiate, the medical profession has on the whole been pleased with the careful and business-like manner in which the HIP program has been carried out.

Despite the fact that HIP coverage will cost the employer an average of \$30 per year for each employee and employee's family, HIP has had a friendly reception by private industry. Several hundred major New York firms responded to the formal announcement that HIP was ready to enroll sub-

scribers. Naturally, many of these firms were seeking information but, in doing so, they showed a healthy appreciation of their employees' problems and of the importance of sound medical care as part of their personnel programs.

Many labor-management welfare funds exist in New York industry. The fur, garment, restaurant, and building industries and many others already have insurance funds. Heretofore, these funds have been spent largely for life insurance or medical expense indemnity plans. Medical care, being more costly and harder to organize, was not included. But meetings with employer associations and the leadership of AFL and CIO unions on a city-wide basis, indicate that before long welfare funds will contract for coverage by HIP on a mass scale.

The fact that key employers helped to organize HIP, took part in the decision to include family coverage, and agreed that employers should pay at least 50 per cent of the HIP bill for both the employee and his family, has helped to convince other employers that the plan has been well conceived. There is a growing recognition in industry of the value of health protection. A report of the National Association of Manufacturers cites the advantages of health programs for employees in terms of better morale, lower accident rates and compensation costs, and a reduction in the strains and anxieties that affect an employee when illness strikes a member of his family.

HIP has been most fortunate that former Mayor LaGuardia's successor, Mayor William O'Dwyer, has proved to be an equally sincere advocate of a health insurance program. The organizers and friends of HIP knew that the program would succeed when Mayor O'Dwyer agreed to join the board of directors and, in spite of severe fiscal problems, urged upon the Board of Estimate the contract covering city employees. Mayor O'Dwyer took a dream and made it a reality.

Before acting upon the HIP contract, the Mayor appointed a committee of five top administrative officials to examine not only HIP but also two non-profit cash indemnity plans which were offered to the city. The committee's final report, which recommended that the Board of Estimate approve a contract with HIP, included the following significant statement:

The advancement of medical science in preventing, diagnosing and curing disease, has greatly increased the cost of medical care. For the average person illness is a chronic threat to solvency. When severe and prolonged illness strikes, it frequently means a financial catastrophe.

Many city employees are constantly in financial difficulties and many others are in financial difficulties at some stage of employment as a result of illness in their families. Because of these financial difficulties, many employees undergo a mental anguish which is detrimental to their work. Others, to obtain money in an effort to pay these debts, seek night employment, which aside from being economically unsound from an employment standpoint, results in mental and physical fatigue which greatly lessens the employee's value to the city. The benefits derived from the city's participation in this plan will far outweigh the costs incurred.

In its income tax law and regulations, the federal government acknowledges that the average head of a family spends 5 per cent of his annual income for medical care. Anything above that amount is regarded as an extraordinary expense. HIP offers to the average worker and his family comprehensive medical care of a quality and in a quantity not previously available at a price within his means. Thanks to HIP and to the fact that the employers of New York will pay part of the total premium, the New York worker may have complete medical and hospital care for himself and his family at less than the cost of a pack of cigarettes per day.

As HIP grows and as it delivers high-quality medical care to the people of New York, other communities may gain inspiration and large numbers of people in the United States may have the medical protection they need.

New York

The Philosophy of Individual Development

By GEOFFREY W. ESTY

SOCIETY IS ILL, desperately ill, and all over the world the political medicine men, mistaking symptoms for the underlying disease process, have been resorting to artificial medicaments from which the patient has shown increasing signs of toxicity. The therapies used have shown little regard for principles of good health, nor an understanding of the dynamic forces of nature. There is imminent need for clear thinking and understanding concerning the operating principles of human relationships and their practical applications to the behavior of society.

The laws of mathematics, chemistry and physics are well known and efficiently exploited either for the benefit or for the destruction of man. But the laws governing the behavior of man himself in his relation to other men remain the mysterious possession of philosophers and psychiatrists, who are still fascinated by the intricacies of vocabulary and exploration rather than by the practical application of these laws to daily living,

Not until there is a common alignment of the natural laws governing the psychobiological nature of man, his spiritual nature, and his economic relation with others, can we hope to develop a healthy social organism. It is the humble purpose of this essay to show that this is not only feasible but necessary, if we are not to go the way of previous civilizations.

I

THE LOGICAL STARTING POINT in this discussion is at the birth of the infant. The still highly controversial effects of the intra-uterine environment upon the basic inherited structure

of the growing embryo need not concern us here. The infant does not start from scratch. That he is "created equal" is perhaps the first common fallacy. At birth, each infant is an unique individual alike to no other in the universe. So-called identical twins are no exception. This uniqueness is composed of an almost infinitesimal combination of inherited and environmental factors. With this assumption, therefore, it is obvious that each individual must be helped to live his own life, as any attempts to mold him into a set, preconceived pattern of behavior will inevitably set up forces in his emotional and personality development which may eventually be enough to upset the balance of his mental and physical framework. Each child has his own combination of weak points and strong points, of aptitudes and deficiencies. This is what makes him "average." But the only equality that children can claim is the equal right to be treated in accordance with their individual needs and rights. This implies the equal opportunity of every child to reach an optimum level of maturity. That there is an innate drive toward optimum maturity has become well known among the researchers of child development, such as Arnold Gesell of the Yale Child Development School of Medicine.

It is well to point out, however, that even within the family group, the needs of any particular child can only be estimated by the understanding parent, for, in the last analysis, it is the child or infant who must have the responsibility of decision of what constitutes the satisfaction of any basic desire or need at any one moment. Even in the new-born baby, the responsibility of eating, sleeping and elimination rests with the infant. He may be offered a set amount of formula, but he alone can determine the exact quantity he wants or needs at any one feeding. Any attempt on the part of the mother to "regulate" the amount taken will result in arbitrary attitudes of force or denial, and the setting up of hostilities and

frustrations on the part of the infant from having been denied its natural inalienable rights. The adage of a "quart of milk a day per child" may be useful in calculating the probable requirements from the milk producer, but it is hardly applicable to the needs of any individual child. This is an important concept, and is often misunderstood.

But what is often equally misunderstood by those unfamiliar with the idea of individual development is that the freedom to develop along an individual growth pattern must be attended by firmness and guidance on the part of the parent. There is no room for "*laissez-faire*," as the term is now understood, in a democratic society. The need for authority remains and is by no means relinquished. The process of acculturation demands a consistent direction. Freedom without law becomes license. Discipline, under this concept, however, becomes a means toward an end, not the end itself. Discipline from without is based on respect rather than on fear, and is a temporary means toward the self-discipline of responsibility. Furthermore, this philosophy does not imply overindulgence or excessive individualism for the same reason. In return for freedom, a democratic culture demands of a growing individual a greater measure of responsibility toward himself and others. The mother in this culture, instead of striving for executive efficiency, tries to be sensitive to the child's needs and behavior, and becomes a true help to his achievement of the maturity status.

The philosophy of individual development, then, utilizes a practical type of psychology in harmony with the laws of human nature and with development of the child's mind. In regard to the latter, the term "mental health" has come into common use and needs to be defined. I have yet to come across a better, simpler and more easily understood definition than the one employed by Dr. George H. Preston in his book

"The Substance of Mental Health."¹ He says that mental health consists of the ability to live:

1. Within the limits imposed by bodily equipment.
2. With other human beings.
3. Happily.
4. Productively.
5. Without being a nuisance.

Such a definition follows no rigid formula to which each individual must be molded. It might be used, with minor adaptations, as a basic requirement of democratic government. It is sound. It is simple. The keystone of mental health is what is now spoken of as a sense of "personal security." The degree to which this sense of personal security is guarded and maintained, from the dependency of early infancy to the independency of the adult, will determine the extent to which the personality of the individual develops.

II

THE FAMILY exists for the security of the individual and his integration as a member of a complex social group. It is a biological and a cultural unit. It serves both for the transmission of old traditions and for the creation of new social values. The home, like the State, has its problems of government. The spirit of liberty and justice which animates every child can be safeguarded best in the home. During the school years, the home retains its function, through the attitudes of parents toward school achievement, to guide and interpret the child's external experiences for his own best development. There has been an increasing tendency for the State to subsidize the home and the education of the child. In Germany before the war and in Russia today, this process of subsidization has reached a point where the child, on reaching the age of five years, has determined for it what its life's work shall

¹ New York, Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1943.

be. State vocational and general education is started before the child is able to develop its own individuality. This may be a necessary procedure, because individualism is always a threat to any collectivist society.

It is at least fortunate that, in our country, schools everywhere are beginning to give consideration to the needs of the individual child. Uniform standards in the school program, however, have resulted in much injustice, and still do. Where adequate allowances for individual differences are not made, unfair comparisons and reproaches inevitably ensue. These are damaging to the sense of personal security, and often result in the "sour-grapes" attitude, or the development of resentments and hostilities. Hate, envy, defiance may also occur. Withdrawal into unsocial solitude occasionally results, or the child may find solace in group activity which will show him admiration often in defiance of what society considers proper. Problems of delinquency appear. The innate striving toward a maximum of maturity is perverted.

At this point, I think it is necessary to clarify what is meant by maturity. What is a mature person? Dr. George B. Chisholm, Deputy Health Minister of Canada, has repeatedly said that there have never been enough mature people in the right places. Maturity, he states, is a quality of personality. It consists of a stick-to-itiveness, a reliability, persistence, and an endurance of difficulties, unpleasantness, discomfort, frustration and hardship. It is the capacity to co-operate with others, and work under authority. It is flexibility, tolerance and patience. Above all, it is adaptability, the ability to compromise, to size things up, and to make one's own decisions. Failure to reach maturity, he believes, is caused by the autocratic control of environment by home, school, church or State, producing shame, fear, guilt, prejudice, intolerance, and suspicion. Is it possible that some of the suspicion, intolerance and difficulty of compromise on the part of the Soviet Union

may not be traced to the results of a controlled autocratic environment?

Dr. Benjamin Spock, in speaking of the autocratic approach to so-called child training, states that a child who has been repeatedly antagonized, may develop the type of character which finds its chief pleasure in being defiant and pugnacious—a self-damaging behavior which may lead to neurosis. He goes on to say that wherever hostile impulses are present, there is fear, for the individual who has a desire to injure others is afraid the object of his destructive attitude will retaliate. Are not these same forces and reactions applicable to the State, if we agree that the whole is but the sum of its parts?

Let us turn for the moment to a consideration of religion in regard to the philosophy of individual development. Too often, in the past, the cultural traditions of religious dogma have been imposed upon the child in an autocratic way. The yoke of sin has been used by many parents as a means of controlling the environment, damaging again the sense of personal security through shame, fear, guilt, prejudice or intolerance. Or in the more national aspect, religion has been taught and used to justify the *status quo* in social economics. Poverty has been sanctified. Not infrequently the natural desires of men for pleasure, happiness or property have been thwarted and condemned. The Brahminism of India, the deification of the Japanese Emperor, or the puritanism of our own New England history are examples. These influences are still strong in our society, and handicap many in reaching their optimum maturity. But is this necessary? Was not the true message of Christ the dignity and sanctity of the individual? Did He not say "the Kingdom of God is within you"? Did He not startle society when He said "Suffer the children to come unto me"? In a world of fearful autocracy and privilege, He dared to preach about the dignity of every human being. Christ above all men taught the philosophy of indi-

vidual liberty. How slow we are to appreciate His real message!

III

COMING NOW to the adult, it must be realized, from what has already been said, that the way we act and react in adulthood and senescence will depend upon the way in which we met the successive tasks of life in our infancy and childhood. What is often not so clearly appreciated is that the adult cannot show a considerate regard for the rights and welfare of others unless he has consistently experienced such consideration during his infancy and childhood. We know now, for instance, that only those children who have realized real unselfish affection during their developing years can in turn show affection toward others. This is true with all human values such as justice, fairplay, honesty, truthfulness. They must have been present in the home atmosphere if they are to appear later in the adult. Unfortunately, the converse is also true. When undesirable attitudes are present in the environment of the growing child, they will likewise become a part of his conduct as an adult.

There is major significance in the fact that 14 per cent of all men between eighteen and thirty-five who appeared before the draft boards were disqualified because of personality disorders. They represented 39 per cent of all rejections. Of those who were accepted and later received medical discharges, 40 per cent had neuropsychiatric difficulties. Does this not indicate that there is something the matter with the much-cherished American way of life? Does this not demonstrate a serious need for more effective understanding by parents, teachers, social workers, ministers, physicians and others having direct contact with the growing child and adolescent, of the normal growth and development of mind, body and emotions?

There has been an increasing tendency on the part of

parents to place the responsibility for the burdens of parenthood upon the school, church, or State. This dependence upon a drug, a "cure," a cult, or upon government, is itself the result of the early home situations of these parents. Whether by overprotection or overindulgence, responsibility and independence have been dulled. The give and take between the members of the large family of several generations ago gave the child an opportunity to find and explore his individuality to a fuller extent despite certain autocratic dictates of the parents. In addition, in these families the child was an economic asset rather than a liability. As the family was more self-supporting, so became the child. In our small families of today, however, the current philosophy is that the State "owes me a living."

State paternalism is a direct outgrowth of this adult dependency. There appear to be increasing numbers of people who, at first thought, would be willing to sacrifice what little individuality they possess in return for a minimum amount of economic security, or a system of charity. For them, a loss of self-respect is not grievous, because it never had a chance to develop adequately. Their personal sense of security, already damaged as the result of the emotional privations of their childhood, is fearful of the added constant threats of economic insecurity. But what they do not realize is that the same forces of human relations which may have prevented them from reaching full emotional maturity continue to harass them as adults in their relation to a paternalistic State. The frustrations experienced in a "controlled" or "planned" economy result in hostility, resentment, defiance, aggression, fear and intolerance. Scapegoats appear as releases for these tensions. These are all symptoms of further strain and damage to the sense of inner security. As the less submissive rebel against the loss of their freedom, greater degrees of force have to be applied by government. Their incentive is penal-

ized through increasing taxation. The development of ability stagnates. As resentments and fears grow, further releases are sought usually in the form of hostility to other classes and eventually toward other States. The mind for war appears and will ultimately be satisfied.

IV

THE STUDY of economic thought in the last four thousand years has repeatedly shown this sequence to have taken place. Socialist ideas are as old as history itself. They have inevitably resulted in slavery, dictatorship, war and chaos, because not only have the natural laws of economics been broken, but the natural law of growth and development of the individual. In such a struggle it is not nature which is damaged, but man.

Repeatedly one hears that individualism or as some social philosophers term it, personalism, is necessarily opposed to social consciousness. It is claimed that the individualist is selfish and greedy and not concerned with the welfare of others. Psychologically, nothing is further from the truth. The selfish, greedy person is one who has never found himself. He has been deprived of normal emotional experiences either by an overly autocratic environment or by overprotection or indulgence on the part of his parents. In either case he remains self-centered, often feels inferior and inadequate, and seeks to compensate by developing a greed for power. Selfish individualism, then, is the result of a lack of an individual developmental experience. It is only when a person is aware of the dignity of his own being, that he is capable of awareness and consideration of others. This important concept needs much re-emphasis.

Equal confusion seems to exist concerning the nature of competition. When no member of any competing group enjoys a special privilege, competition serves to stimulate

initiative and ability. In the school years, competition for general co-operative behavior and increasing maturity should be stressed rather than comparative grades in scholastic achievement. In political economy, successful competition actually depends upon the degree to which the consumer has been served through co-operation. This competition for the co-operation of the consumer has been lost sight of in the condemnation of competition based on special privilege. The one serves the public; the other does not.

The word Justice implies some of the most important basic tenets of the philosophy of individual development. Every growing child is acutely aware of a sense of fairness. Injustice in the parent-child relationship can be most damaging to the sense of personal security, and results in a host of emotional reactions. Early in the development of the child, the private possession of property is linked up with this sense of justice. What a child has made himself, or what he has fairly acquired, is vigorously defended. But at the same time he learns to consider quite naturally other material things in his environment as belonging to the family. The confiscation of any object properly his, will set loose violent behavior. It is important to point out that where a child's rights are respected, learning to share comes easily. Sharing in the regimented State, however, gives way to arbitrary decision by force of law. It is not surprising, therefore, that nowhere in socialist writings do we find justice prominently mentioned. We must realize that the confiscation of private property through taxation is accompanied by the same resentments and hostilities that afflict the child, for in both cases the natural law of human relations has been violated. These violations can be endured, of course, but if they are extended, an unstable state of society will ultimately result.

In the economic relations between men, the word Justice has yet another meaning, related to the moral concept, but not

identical with it. St. Thomas Aquinas said "Justice is a constant and perpetual will to yield to each one his right." Justice is a condition of equality of opportunity. Men as unique individuals are equal only to the extent of their equality of opportunity. This, as Francis Neilson has shown,² is in the nature of a natural law. It is perfectly consistent with and an integral part of the philosophy of individual development. It is applicable to all human affairs. Justice holds the key for the solution of our economic relations, and enables us to enter into equilibrium with the laws of nature, and avoid man-created Statism and anarchy. The practical application of economic justice will enable man to acquire for himself individually-created values, and allow society to acquire socially-created values.

V

NEARLY EVERY ADULT in our present society, regardless of income, has a basic feeling of economic insecurity. The wealthy are fearful of losing their accustomed way of living. The poor are constantly struggling against the threat of poverty. Socio-economic security is one of the most fundamental determinants of mental health. Dr. Gesell has stated that "freedom from want in a socio-economic sense remains a first essential for freedom from psychological want." The experience of crowded homes and tenements, the lack of privacy, the shiftlessness of many families produce manifold emotional shocks upon the growing child, often handicapping it for the remainder of its life. The following is a partial list of problems commonly having their roots in socio-economic factors: prostitution, syphilis, sexual maladjustments, marriage postponements, tuberculosis and other environmental and occupational diseases, cerebral birth trauma, alcoholism, drug addictions, avitaminosis, manic-depressive

² Cf. Francis Neilson, "In Quest of Justice," New York, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1944.

and schizophrenic psychoses, suicides, gambling, delinquency and crime. The age-old problem of poverty must be solved.

There are but three ways to deal with poverty. The first is to sanctify it so its victims will endure it. For centuries Brahminism and other eastern religions have taught that, in as much as nothing could be done about poverty, the only way to live with the problem was to convince the people that this world was at best a horrible experience which had to be endured temporarily, and that the slaves and the impoverished were being punished for their sins committed in a previous existence. All the desires for pleasure, satisfaction or property were declared to be against the moral code. Similar rationalizations appear in Christian theologies. In Japan, it was considered to be great and noble to die and to starve for one's emperor. Christianity has had a resigned attitude toward poverty. "The poor you have always with you" has been interpreted by misguided theologians as statement rather than reproach. Such resignation has helped to maintain the *status quo* in socio-economics.

The second way to deal with poverty is to attempt to reduce everyone to a lower common denominator of living. This provides the poor or the unemployed with a somewhat higher standard of existence, along with the sacrifice of the freedom and liberty of everyone. Differences between "New-Dealism," Socialism and Communism in this regard are only a matter of degree. Some wag has said in answer to Stalin's complaint that the western capitalist countries always had periodic depressions, that Russia had, instead, to endure a constant state of depression.

The third, last and only way to deal with the problem of poverty is to solve it through the application of the natural law of economic justice. This law states that "every producer of wealth shall have, with every other producer, equality of opportunity of access to that from which all products must

come—the land; and that every producer shall be assured of his ownership and possession of that which he does produce.” Such a law of justice can only be achieved within the framework of a truly democratic society where the dignity of each individual is assured.

VI

IF ANY DOUBT remains concerning the fundamental psychology correctness of the democratic ideology, let me describe briefly a film I saw about 12 years ago.³ This sound film showed three groups of nine- or ten-year-old boys with about ten boys in each group. They were organized into a Dick Tracy recreational and manual training club. The purpose of the film was to show the effect on children of the autocratic, the democratic, and *laissez-faire* approach. The boys were photographed entirely without their knowledge. Each group had a supervisor. The first could be seen ordering and directing each boy as to his duties, just what he should construct with his wood, and how he was to do it. The instructor then paced the floor, pointing here and there and seeing to it that efficiency of performance was maintained. He did not enter into any work himself. Soon laughter and spontaneity disappeared. The atmosphere became silent and efficient. Good production was achieved. Later, as arranged, the instructor left the room for ten minutes, and immediately the boys dropped their tools, talked and began to indulge in horseplay. The moment the teacher reappeared, they quickly and silently resumed their tasks.

Then a very interesting thing began to happen. In later meetings this group started to divide itself into two sub-groups. One sub-group apparently accepted this dependency upon a leader, seemed reasonably content and continued to work without protest. The other sub-group became in-

³ “Experimental Studies in Social Climates of Groups.”

creasingly more resentful and restless, but because there was no way for them to display their hostility against the leader of the system, they began, during the ten-minute absence of the instructor, to pick upon a certain boy in their group, who became a veritable scapegoat. They made his life miserable with their teasing. Interestingly enough, the subject for their abuse was the racial and sociologic status of this boy's father. Here you have, with utmost clarity and significance, the essence of fascism, paternalism, collectivism if you wish, and the inevitable release by means of hostility, and intolerance toward a scapegoat. One could speculate that hostility toward other groups might eventually have resulted.

In the democratically-organized group, the instructor gave consideration to minority as well as to majority opinion as to what the particular group project should be. He then took up his own tools and worked *with* his boys, giving guidance and instruction where needed. Talk, laughter and spontaneity continued, but at the same time there was efficient production. When the instructor left the room for ten minutes, work continued without interruption. On his return, he had merely to pick up his tools again and proceed with his work. The boys were happy. They were secure. There was co-operation. They alone satisfied the definition of mental health as given earlier in this paper: "The ability to live within the limits imposed by bodily equipment, with other human beings, happily, productively, and without being a nuisance."

The leader of the third group was instructed to give as little guidance or direction as possible to his boys. He was to let them do exactly as they wished with a minimum of help or authority. At first the boys could be seen working happily and productively; but soon signs of disintegration set in. Attentions became diverted. Misbehavior and rough-housing appeared. Soon the general turmoil interfered with any con-

structive efforts. This group failed because there was no leadership, no law, no respect for the right of others. The remainder of the experiment demonstrated the relative speed in which the group behaviors changed, as the same instructors changed their approach.

Here the basic soundness of democracy is beautifully illustrated. Democracy is psychologically and spiritually sound, because it is based upon the natural laws of growth and development and the respect for the individual as a human being equal in the sight of God. If given the chance, democracy can be economically sound as soon as we are willing to give the justice of equality of opportunity a chance to operate. When, at last, we shall have learned this lesson, we need fear the future no longer. Liberty, the life-blood of democracy, shall flow in ever richer and fuller streams, and man shall be the glorious creature that he is by nature intended to be.

VII

SUMMARY: In this paper I have tried to show that a considerate regard for the individual is a primary requisite for optimum maturity and mental health. I sought to demonstrate that this developmental philosophy is a part of the democratic ideology and a motivating force in the home and society. Finally, I pointed out that freedom from want in a socio-economic sense remains a first essential for freedom from psychological want.⁴

⁴ I am indebted to Arnold Gesell and Francis Ilg ("Infant and Child in the Culture of Today," New York, Harper Brothers) for the thought and phraseology used in this summary.

Westfield, N. J.

Civilization has turned out to be a conspiracy against essential things. It is so with the individual. Everything conspires against him. Civilization clutters him up with all the ephemera of politics, commerce and social affairs. If he is a poor man, it is the grind of poverty brought about by civilization. If he is a rich man, it is place or power, aggrandizement, pride, which hold him day and night. . . . It is all wrong—wrong in the church, wrong in Parliament, wrong everywhere—and I am afraid that we shall have to pay bitterly for it. But what disgusts me more than anything else is the moral and intellectual cowardice that is rampant today. We suppress our best thoughts because we think, if we uttered them, our friends would laugh. We are afraid of their derision.

FRANCIS NEILSON

Problems and Prospects in Hittite Studies

By JOHN GARSTANG

INVITED COURTEOUSLY to contribute to a volume of studies in tribute to Francis Neilson, I do so gladly and gratefully. For it is entirely due to his broad vision and greatness of heart that I was enabled in 1936 to resume my researches in Asia Minor, and to make at Mersin, on an old trade route near the Mediterranean coast, discoveries that link the nascent civilization of Europe with the established culture and history of the ancient monarchies of the Near East (c. 3000 B.C.). That is only one part of a long story to be told about the remarkable remains of antiquity revealed by the excavation of this site in the years before the war.

During the present winter season (1946-7) I hope to complete the practical side of the work, and having already published an account of results thus far obtained in the *American Journal of Archaeology*,¹ I propose in the following sketch to indicate further possibilities of discovery on other Hittite and contemporary sites in Anatolia and the wide interest that would inevitably be aroused by the discovery of fresh documentary materials.

I

Mapping the Hittite Empire

AS IS NOW well known, the excavations made in one ancient site, near a village called in Turkish Boğaz Koï, resulted not only in the recognition of that place as the Capital City of Hatti, the historic center of the Hittite Empire, but in the recovery of the imperial archives of the "Great Kings" of the 14th and 13th Centuries B.C. These, long worked upon by philologists, have now given up their long-buried secrets.

¹ Vol. XLVII (1943), No. 1, pp. 1-14.

They include numerous records of military adventure and achievement, of relations with friend and foe, and of recurring periods of danger to the throne and Empire.

But even when lucidly translated from the Hittite idiom, these fascinating records remain largely unintelligible or at least deprived of their essential value for want of a reliable map whereby the setting and scale of the episodes described may be appreciated. Materials for drawing such a map are there in plenty, but they do not provide a coherent picture, for the simple reason that few of the numerous geographical names occurring in the Hittite texts can be located. It is only when the scene of operations moves down from the plateau of Asia Minor to the Semitic world of Syria that we find ourselves on familiar ground.

Thus some records of Suppi-luliuma, the leading Empire builder, not only establish contact with the area east of the Euphrates and trace his victorious armies as far south as Harran and Haleb (Aleppo), but introduce a series of other names in central Syria already known from the Amarna letters of Egypt. In this way we get an indication of the extent of his campaigns in that direction, some 300 miles from the Hittite Capital. In some cases we can follow his progress on the map, and by comparison with Egyptian records we can realize the political significance of his conquests and diplomacy. Interpretation of these records is made possible by the existence of an accepted map of Syria and Mesopotamia at the time, and facilitated by the fact that most of the archives relating to Syria are in Semitic. For Asia Minor, however, there is no accepted map; and hundreds of documents, usually in Hittite, refer exclusively to places nearer home upon the plateau, most of which are quite unknown.

Indeed, the sites of only three Hittite cities named in the Hittite texts can be fixed by direct evidence of local monuments or records, namely, Hattusas, the Capital, at Boğaz

Koï (the classical Pteria), inside the loop of the Halys River; Kanes, an old trading center, just across that river to the southeast of the capital; and Tuwanuwa (spelt in hieroglyphs Tu.wa.na) at Bor, the classical Tyana. Some other places can be located tentatively by comparison of contexts, and two rivers, *viz.*, the "Great River" and the Marassantia, may be recognized respectively as the Euphrates and the Halys (the Red River or Kizil Irmak).

These identifications form the essential starting points for any attempt to reconstruct the map; but in the meanwhile the narratives remain shorn of their true meaning, and their fuller interpretation becomes obscured by the necessity for detailed argument and extraneous comparisons. This state of affairs deprives would-be students of a rich new material with ever-widening ramifications of the highest interest and historical significance.

II

The Location of Arzawa

SIMILAR DIFFICULTIES confront us in the archives of the next king, Mursil, who inherited much of his father's genius; only in this case they become tantalizing, for the records of his reign are exceptionally complete and graphic. They include an account of far-reaching campaigns which he led in person during the first ten years of his reign, and a further parallel series of official records covering also the activities of his generals over a period of nearly thirty years. Mursil's visits to Syria were few, and though the links established on those occasions with his eastern domain are helpful in localizing States and places in the basin of the Euphrates and the rival Kingdom of Azzi-Hayasa further north, the great bulk of his narrative is concerned with Asia Minor.

In particular he gives a full account of the subjugation of Arzawa, a powerful Kingdom known already from two

Amarna letters, and a perpetual rival of Hatti from early times. Both narratives tell how he overran that country in a major campaign in which he was assisted by his brother the King of Carchemish, and was also joined by the King of Mira, one of the greater vassals of Arzawa itself. In a pitched battle he broke up the enemy's forces, assembled in strength by the River Astarpa, into three groups which were overcome separately, while he himself penetrated even to the sea at Apasas where stood a chief residence of the Arzawan King. But there is nothing in the texts to show directly which river of Asia Minor was the Astarpa, nor is it clear which of the three seas bounding the peninsula is that in question.

In addition to this and many other accounts of his military successes, Mursil has left us also copies of a number of treaties made after the conquest of Arzawa with members of the Arzawan confederacy. One of these was Mira, and in this case the text actually defines in some detail the boundaries that separated it from the land of Hatti.

On this side the town of Maddunassa . . . fortress of Dudhalia shall be your boundary; but on this side shall the military posts of Wiyawada be your boundary. Now into the town of Aura you shall not go over. On this side onwards the River Astarpa . . . the land of Kuwalia (shall) be your boundary. This land be yours: protect it. And from the River Astarpa and from the River Siyanta you shall not occupy a single city.

Unfortunately the text itself does not indicate where the various places mentioned are to be located, though as a geographical picture the passage obviously presents possibilities of a clue. Examination of the physical features and other related criteria does in fact enable us to localize the boundary with a measure of certainty and to ascribe this State to the later district of greater or southern Phrygia.

Mira had almost the status of an independent Kingdom, and seems at one time to have been in direct communication with Egypt. Its contacts, as disclosed in the texts, serve as

a link not only between fellow members of the Arzawan group but more widely between several smaller kingdoms of the west and the Hittite dominions in the south-center of the plateau. It becomes therefore one of our key positions theoretically fixed.

The localization of Mira enables us, *inter alia*, to attempt to place its major partner, Arzawa, with which it must have been contiguous. But the evidence is inconclusive and we are left with two alternatives—a location in Lycia and part of Pisidia, with the capital at Habasos (otherwise Abasos, later Anti-Phellus), or alternatively in Lydia with its capital at Ephesus. Circumstantial evidence and the implications of tradition are all in favor of the latter solution: a single direct pointer might decide the issue, but it remains to be discovered.

One relevant record is worth mention. The Hittite armies on their march toward Arzawa are said to have seen a thunderbolt which passed them and fell in the capital city of Apasas. This calls vividly to mind the meteorite (mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles)² which formed a central feature in the cult and temple of Diana of Ephesus. The parallelism is perfect and tempts one to accept without further inquiry the location of Apasas at Ephesus. However, the problem is not to be solved so easily; but the possibilities of great discoveries to be made by further excavation at Ephesus cannot be overestimated.

If it prove to be the capital of Arzawa, the discovery of inscribed tablets might unfold new chapters of history; for the contacts with Egypt and with Hatti are already established, and this site on the Aegean coast would inevitably be involved in Achaean intrigue and adventure. In this case Greek legends, the stories of Pelops and even the battle for Troy might receive realistic illumination. Discoveries of great interest might also attend the excavation of the capital

² Acts, XIX, 35.

of Mira, with the recovery there also of the State archives known to exist. Possibly the classical city of Sagalassos marks its whereabouts. The alternative site of Apasas at Habasos, better known as the classical Anti-Phellus, also invites excavation. The ruins are found in a sheltered bay, with the island of Meis (otherwise Casteloriza) off the shore.

III

The Homeric Legend

UNDER MUWATALLI, the next Great King, though the records of his reign are not so plentiful, we find more light from the Egyptian side. The struggle between Hatti and Egypt for supremacy in Syria came to a head in the historic battle of Kadesh (*c.* 1292 B.C.), and here we get a fixed date, which, with the help of other synchronisms, provides a basis for the chronology of the Imperial Hittite period. Of more immediate concern is the list of allies who fought on the side of the Hittite King, "lured," says the Egyptian record, "by Hittite gold." In this mighty struggle appears a number of peoples whose names recall some of the tribal units mentioned in the Homeric legend as fighting in defense of Troy—Darden, Luka, Pedes, Kelekesh and Mesa, suggestive respectively of the Dardanoi, Lukioi, (Leleges of) Pedasos, Kilikes and Musoi of the Homeric legend.

The resemblance of these names suggests a wide range of Hittite influence toward the northwest of Asia Minor; and this impression appears to be supported by the two title names of a treaty made also by Muwatalli with a western prince, *viz.*, Alaksandus of Uilusa. The fact that Uilusa, by a process of elimination, must be ascribed to the north-west of the peninsula and its association with the peculiar personal name of Alaksandus, so clearly resembling that of Alexander, a second name of Paris the Trojan prince, seem to point toward Ilios and Troy; and there is a further suggestion of

the same kind in the association with Uilusa in a later text giving a list of rebels and enemies of the name Taruisa.

Yet these suggestions are probably illusory. In the first place Taruisa is the name of a district; and in the second we find that Uilusa cannot well be placed at Land's End because of a clause concerning refugees in Muwatalli's treaty:

If any refugee captured from enemy country is (in flight from the Land of Hatti) and is going through thy lands across, and thou seizest him. . . .

The passage is partly restored, but the essential part is intact: it seems to indicate that, for occasional refugees, Uilusa might provide a passageway through to a non-Hittite sphere beyond. If this interpretation is correct, it becomes impossible to identify Uilusa with Ilios notwithstanding the suggestion of the several coincidences of names that have been mentioned. A major part of our problem is therefore to sift and scrutinize the evidence of the texts; and experience shows that name resemblance is of little value except in corroboration of an identification already strongly indicated on safer ground.

While dismissing the speculative aspect of inquiry based on assonance or resemblance of names alone, it is not without a quickened interest that, in fact, we shall find some of the tribal names quoted above to be reflected by district names in the Hittite archives, notably, Lukka, Pitassa, Karkissa and Masa; and also contexts which will enable us to fix the position of one at least (Pitassa) with certainty, and to localize the others. Of particular interest is the name Lukka, which simulates the Egyptian Lukku or Ruku closely, and its identity is seemingly confirmed by the association of its people with the Akhiyans or Akhiyawans, just as were the Lukku with the Ekवेश (now generally recognized as the Achaeans) in a piratical descent on Cyprus, c. 1230-1226 B.C.

The wisdom of rejecting without fuller explanation the identity of these place names with the tribal lists of Homer,

already quoted, will become apparent at once when we realize that all four are to be assigned a southerly location on the peninsula. This does not deny all reality in the Homeric picture, rather it consolidates the background; and the explanation of the presence of these peoples at Kadesh as at Troy is probably the same, that they were represented by roving warrior bands drawn from their homes by lure of profit or adventure.

IV

Racial and Political Problems

THOUGH ELUSIVE and nebulous as yet, the Homeric picture, seen in the fresh light of expanding Hittite relations in the west, becomes fascinating when the name of Akhiya or Akhiyawa is found to be associated with others, geographical and personal, which seem to connect it with the western coast. One such is Lasbas, presumably the island of Lesbos, which lay within the Achaeans sphere of influence according to the Homeric catalogue. Another is that of a leader named Tawagalas, thought by Forrer to be identifiable with Eteocles, but more plausibly, as now suggested by Phythian Adams, with Deucalion, legendary brother of a Cretan Minos, with whom he was associated in the suppression of "Carian" pirates.

The identity of the Akhiyans (otherwise written Akhiyawans) with the Achaeans is hardly doubtful, since a passage in the *Annals of Mursil* shows that the King of Akhiyawa dwelt across the sea. It refers to the flight and extradition of a son of the Arzawan King, who had taken refuge with his father to an island (lit. "in the sea") on the approach of Mursil's forces to their Capital at Apasas. It reads as follows:

- 1c. (. . . he) was (in the sea) therein
1. . . . the son of Uhhi-Ziti
2. . . . and he (went) out of the sea
3. (away, and he came) to the King of the country of Akhiyawa

4. (There) I (King Mursil) dispatched (emisarries) on ship
5. and led him away.
6. (And the King of the Country Akhiyawa hand)ed (him over to me) and they led him away.³

The gaps caused by damage to the tablet are vexatious, but no one can dispute the scholarly restoration based on parallel records. They are in any case not essential to the argument; it is clear that, when the prince fled from the island to the King of Akhiyawa, he crossed the sea—not back to the mainland of Asia Minor, but across to the opposite side, since it was necessary to send for him by ship. Akhiyawa or Akhiya is thus located, as was Achaia, on the mainland of Greece. Since also the two sets of episodes are contemporary or nearly so—the Hittite records of the Akhiyans on the one hand and the Homeric and other legends of the Achaeans on the other—it is inconceivable that these two peoples were not one and the same.

This conclusion illustrates the main point of this short sketch. The Hittite records were discovered in the course of excavation on one special site in Asia Minor. The existence of others has been indicated, and there remain numerous other racial and historical problems to be solved—who were the Gasgan foes of the Hittites who hovered continuously on their northern horizon, ever ready to raid and plunder the Hittite homelands when the imperial troops were absent on distant campaigns? Do they represent an early movement from southern Russia, by sea or land, like those of the Cimmerians and Scythians in later centuries? Who, again, was Mita of Pahhuwa who rebelled against the last of the great Hittite Kings? His home on the eastern frontier of the Hittite Empire abutted on the territory inhabited, according to Herodotus and Xenophon, by the Moschoi. Was he the first of that name who, as Mita of Muski, offered strenuous opposition to the Assyrian invaders? Was he related to the Phrygian

³ From p. 67 of Prof. Goetze's edition, the standard work on this text.

Kings called Midas? Similar problems await solution on every side.

The keys lie buried in the Anatolian soil. I bequeath this thought to the coming generation of explorers. May they all meet their Francis Neilsons to give them courage and material support!

*Neilson Expedition to the Near East,
University of Liverpool Institute of Archaeology*

Taxation and Redress in Early Yemen

By SIDNEY SMITH

THERE IS NO TRUTH less often recognized in the study of almost any subject than the importance of understanding the history of the subject itself. No one has more consistently urged the need for such study than Dr. Francis Neilson, more especially in understanding the subject of the rights of the individual. These lines are set down in the hope that he may himself be interested in a few facts that are little known about the administration of economic justice in a remote corner of the ancient world.

Oriental monarchies have, nowadays, a uniformly bad press. Whenever an editorial writer, more particularly in *The Times* of London, wants to abuse some tyrannous system in Europe, "Oriental" monarchs, unnamed, are dragged in, or, if the case is particularly bad, more often than not the Assyrians are mentioned; Byron's words stick in the mind from childhood, and the *cliché* will not lead to a libel. Short reflection might suffice to recall that Eastern monarchies have been innumerable and very different in type. A little reading might show that some have been firmly based on the loyal support of their subjects, and it would not be difficult, in the lands of Islam at any rate, to find a reason for that. The Sultans have in general obeyed the tenets of their creed and Arab custom, essentially equalitarian in questions of personal liberty, by allowing the individual Moslem free access to his ruler. Each case is generally considered speedily and cheaply, bribes included, an advantage more highly organized systems, however perfect theoretically, do not always afford.

I

EARLY YEMEN was divided into four, and sometimes into more, kingdoms, Ma'in (the southern Jawf), Saba (roughly the modern Imamate), Qataban (rather larger than the Aden Protectorate) and Hadhramawt. Each thrived on the caravan traffic in incense and similar goods, and was able, therefore, to support the immense labor of creating irrigation systems; only so could the seasonal deficiency of water be overcome and an increasing settled population supported.

Any dynast in these kingdoms, whether he inherited the throne or usurped it, was dependent on the support of his people, more especially of the fighting men. The way to obtain that support lay through the administration of the kingdom's resources to the advantage of the majority; that is, by securing to each citizen as great wealth as possible at the cheapest rate in taxation. This, of course, is a truism but it is more important in this instance because the emphasis should be on 'resources.' These were not expressed in terms of any coinage, for then, as now, coinage, after it was introduced at a rather late date, was very restricted, and almost confined to two denominations. The goods that were presumably brought in from Palestine and Syria as exchange by the caravans were necessary imports. Taxes were collected in kind or in labor. In cases where taxation grew too heavy, payment might be a physical impossibility, and constantly mounting arrears irredeemable. Remission was then essential, and some of the inscriptions are decrees dealing with such cases, recorded on stone as a proof of validity.

Mere remission of a tax that has proved impossible to collect is, perhaps, a belated admission of injustice rather than an act of justice. The real interest lies in the machinery employed, and to explain that it is necessary to have a concrete case. Here is a paraphrase—exact translation of the ancient lan-

guage is still impossible—of a decree of a king of Saba, remitting taxes collected earlier in his reign, and stating how an annual valuation is to be made of seasonal produce which must be included with prices received and goods taken in exchange in totals liable to taxation.

Thus replied *Ykrb-mlk Wtr*, king of Saba, son of *Yd 'El Byn*, together with those who were summoned and the 'friends' who have perpetual entry, and the 'boon companions,' the chiefs, and the *nzbt*-officers and the 'collectors' and the *mswd*, all of them, on this wise.

All demands and proclamations and the alms and increases and deliveries of goods that he demanded of them, namely of the Sabaeans and their tribes, are rejected and ended as imposts on his subjects, namely the Sabaeans and the tribe *Ybblh* and their sons and their allies, their *mswd* and their *qsd* and their dependents—let them post (the decree) up (??) in the north and in the south—as far back as the season (so-and-so) in the year of the eponym (so-and-so), the time when *Yd 'El Byn*, king of Saba, son of *Kariba-El Wtr* constituted the assembly of Saba and *Ybblh* and caused them to mix so that they might hold meetings and mingle in the town Sirwah, in accordance with the inscribed answer *Yd 'El Byn* returned to them.

Fruits shall be sold unripe among the things for purchase and things returned (*i.e.* goods exchanged) so that they may render their things for purchase and things returned in accordance with their written and verbal accounts.

This reply was made on (such-and-such a date). List of witnesses, (headed by the name of the king of Saba, and ended by that of the 'king' of the settlements).

II

CERTAIN LEGITIMATE INFERENCES from this document can be reinforced by the consideration of other passages in inscriptions which are not always clear in detail, because the expressions used are not readily translatable through Arabic equivalents. The decree is framed as a 'reply,' obviously to a plea made by certain inhabitants, 'settlers,' of the important city Sirwah, drawn from the Sabaean tribes and principally, it would seem, from the one actually named. These 'settlers' had the right of assembly by themselves and to representation

in the town council of Sirwah from their first introduction into the city in the time of the father and immediate predecessor of the king issuing the decree. During his reign the king issuing the decree had made certain demands upon these men, called in this phrase "Saba and their tribes," (because they were not only Sabaeans but men of the sub-tribes) by way of requisition and edict ('demands and proclamations'), by religious taxes steadily augmented ('alms and increases') and by calls for supplies, probably during a time of war ('deliveries of goods'). The plea was presented to the royal council representative of the whole nation, a significant institution in all these Southern Arabian kingdoms. Such councils can and do exist under many forms of monarchy; there is nothing 'republican' about them, though this is not infrequently stated, but they are, in monarchy or republic, where they exist, organs for insuring the execution of administrative orders and for securing local equity. What is significant in the present case is the right of appeal to such a council by a part of the population of Sirwah.

The royal councils appear fairly frequently in the inscriptions from Saba and Qataban, and are sometimes described, in the case of Qataban, as 'Qataban, that is the *mswd* who attend the assembly, and Qataban, that is, the people.' It was, then, representative of the whole people through a two-fold division, much like the Macedonian division into classes, cavalry—infantry. The word *mswd*, though it is often taken to mean in itself a council, is really a collective plural like *masbaikh*, denoting the body of elders, men with the training and experience to administrate and advise, the senatorial element, with whom administrative officers are sometimes mentioned. The king's officers in the present case were the 'friends,' presumably the active ministers of state as the 'friends' were in Egypt, and those chiefs who accompanied

the king on campaigns, at the hunt and at the table, the 'boon companions,' a term which came to mean something very like 'sot' to the followers of Muhammad, when the institutions of the pagans were reviled. The *nzbt* were men who drew up such official documents as this decree, and were present to perform their duties. The 'collectors' are presumably men engaged in collecting dues from the king's subjects.

But the 'settlers' were themselves represented on this particular occasion, and it is significant that, in the list of signatories to the decree, just as the king of Saba comes first, the 'king of the settlers' comes last. These settlers had been introduced into Sirwah in the time of a king who was one of a line which established Sabaean control over the incense trade route from about the northwestern border of Hadhramawt as far north as the borders of the southern Jawf. That control was only secured and maintained by constant wars, sometimes against local chiefs who claimed an independent right to levy tolls on passing caravans; the inevitable result of such campaigns was that veteran soldiers had to be rewarded in the normal way of ancient times, by settling them on the land. The only land worth settling soldiers on was confined to the wadis in which well-constructed irrigation systems made settled agriculture, especially the cultivation of the date-palm, profitable; one of the richest areas of the kind was Sirwah. The act of settlement was accompanied by the 'constituting of an assembly' of the place settled, just as before a war or any important act of state an 'assembly' of certain national gods was 'constituted,' so that they might approve the act. The purpose of the constitution was to secure the rights of the settlers both as forming themselves a community and as citizens of Sirwah.

III

GOVERNMENTS RARELY ABIDE by promises and agreements. It is not much good blaming monarchies in this respect, for

all types of government can be proved to share this characteristic. The means employed for breaking down privileges previously granted are nearly always the same, decrees, 'Orders in Council' or whatever they may be called. There is always, or perhaps it would be better to say generally, a good reason for the first breach, due to some emergency. The first imposition of new taxation is most often ascribed to the need for defense, and the necessity for maintaining an army in the field. Hence the requisitions of supplies and proclamations calling upon men declared free from service and all the other demands which, once imposed, are never willingly relaxed by officers of State and often exceed the ability of the community concerned to pay. In a council representative of the whole nation, the particular position of a relatively small community is not likely to receive careful attention, especially if the administrative and executive officers of State are fully represented. It is therefore peculiarly interesting to find that in this, as in another exceptional decree of the same kind, the first members of the council concerned to consider this plea of the settlers were 'those who were summoned.' This phrase, not immediately intelligible to us by itself, requires interpretation.

In Abyssinia, at any rate until quite recent years, private disputes were settled in public places, but without recourse to any official unless such recourse was specially desired. The disputants would call upon certain persons to act as judges of the question put before them, and the persons thus summoned consented to act in this way as a discharge of their normal duties as citizens. Evidence was given in the form of question and answer, and there were of course interminable speeches; bystanders often joined in the discussion. Such cases amount to something like a *procès verbal*. The aim was to obtain an admission from one party or the other that he was wrong; any

decision by the judges had no other claim to validity than the consent of the disputants. Where such disputes could not be settled by consent, the legal officer of the district appointed by the king would be required, and there was, at least theoretically, the right of appeal to the provincial Ras or even to the king himself.

This accords with very ancient legal practice; the same sort of choice is exemplified in documents belonging to the nineteenth century B.C. from Cappadocia, in which the trade disputes of Syrian and Assyrian merchants engaged in the metal and textile trades were recorded. In such cases two or three men were 'seized' by the disputants, and recorded the pleas and evidence on either side. Binding decisions could only be obtained from the officials representing the governing body of the trading colony, the 'quay house.' The main duty of the persons 'seized,' who had to be scribes or persons who could write, was to see that a proper record was made.

Beduin law retains some liberty of choice as to judges, provided the man chosen is a *qadhi*, a restriction due in part to the religious law schools. In Southern Arabia only one ancient document survives to prove that this system still held good for private law there also, and that is unfortunately only preserved in the opening lines. It is numbered 976 in the great *Corpus* containing these inscriptions, and is in the Bombay Museum. It starts with the names of two private persons, and continues: "Thus replied those who were summoned and the Sabaeans attending the assembly to (so-and-so)." The rest is lost. But that is enough for the present purpose; it serves to show that Abyssinia preserved in this respect, as in many others, customs prevalent in Southern Arabia before the Hejra. The only possible interpretation of this document is that the reply given was a judgment delivered. The persons delivering the judgment, whom we should call judges in a

court of first instance, are simply entitled 'those who were summoned,' men called to act as umpires in a private dispute.

IV

'THOSE WHO WERE SUMMONED' to the royal council held specially to deal with the pleas of the settlers in Sirwah were probably just such persons as those mentioned in the private case, men nominated by the settlers to hear their grievances and attending the council with the record before them. The case they had to put can be guessed from the text. When originally settled, the new colonists would all have to pay a yearly tax, and the original custom in Southern Arabia seems to have been that the yearly tax on land was paid during a season called (for instance in the inscription no. 3566, line 22, of the *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique*), 'the time of imposts' (or, literally, 'of things rendered'). But harvests of different kinds do not fall together, and taxes were generally paid in kind. Hardship can be the result of constant payment in kind in dribblets, and no doubt the habits of inspecting officials, and the carriage of payment in kind to the place appointed, imposed variable costs that might ruin a small farmer. In any case the decree implies that one part of the settlers' plea demanded an annual valuation and a single collection of the tax on agricultural produce. The other part was for the removal of additional imposts from which the settlers claimed to be exempt. The decree itself shows that 'those who were summoned' were able to convince the king's council that both pleas were justified.

If the words used are legitimately paraphrased as above, in accordance with the Arabic roots—they have been interpreted to mean the opposite—the additional imposts, even those for temple revenue called 'alms,' were all remitted. The plea for the single collection of tax was settled by a method we should

consider normal, but which, so far as is known from earlier records in other lands, was not practiced in antiquity. The main obstacle, the valuation of the date harvest at the time of the grain harvest for the assessment of tax, obviously introduced difficulties, or perhaps, like other forms of speculation, was never conceived. In the decree the valuation of the future crop is called a sale of the unripe fruit; the amount is to be written, or given verbal account of, when the annual return of income, that is the results of barter or sale, was made. The sale of the unripe fruit contemplated was presumably a nominal one; the only immediate practical effect would be that the tax collector would demand the delivery of the government's dues, probably one-third of the 'price' arrived at, in some form, at some stipulated date. If the 'price,' that is the valuation of the future crop, was a fair one, then full justice was done to the settlers in this decree.

It is interesting to note that, whether in fact the valuations carried out under this decree, probably at some date a good deal earlier than Alexander the Great's invasion of Western Asia, were fair or not, the sale of unripe fruit became a by-word for extortion by the seventh century A.D. and was forbidden under Islam. The change which so constantly takes place in every country in every period is thus exemplified in ancient Yemen. What was apparently meant to be an act of justice introduced an administrative measure which led to great injustice, as such valuations arbitrarily imposed by an official might well prove to be.

V

THERE HAVE BEEN THOSE who have found in every decree of the ancient kings of Yemen extortionate measures to secure more taxes; such scholars interpret these ancient texts in much the same way as one school of modern political thought

sees in the Reformation or the Industrial Revolution, or almost any event before the twentieth century, a wicked *bourgeoisie* exploiting the labouring classes. Their interpretation colors their translations of the texts. A more patient approach will not justify this view.

There were in some ancient monarchies institutions like the king's council in the present decree, assemblies in which both matters of State were considered and legal decisions were promulgated. Such assemblies are known from scattered references in the early city States of Mesopotamia, and, as so often elsewhere, are called by some 'republican.' Those in Yemen could differ in constitution and so meet particular needs.

The system was not ill devised to meet man's perpetual cry for justice, the cry which Dr. Neilson has followed through the ages in his book, "In Quest of Justice." But Justice is a word, or an idea, whichever you will, that has never been satisfactorily defined. Like health, or liberty, the individual only wants it if he hasn't got it—and most often for himself only.

Types of government meant to secure justice for all have throughout history proved corruptible, and become an instrument of oppression by one or by a few or even by an intolerant majority. By the Christian era the kings of Yemen had dispensed with such councils as that which helped the king to issue the decree described here.

*Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities,
British Museum, London*

Education for the Good Life— on the Farm

By GEORGE F. HELICK

THE LARGE MAJORITY of State universities in the United States were created as land-grant colleges for the purpose of teaching agriculture first, mechanical arts and sciences second. Abraham Lincoln very wisely recognized that agricultural training was needed for the farm boy and girl and, hence, he approved the plan under which part of the country's natural resources was to be devoted to financing such training. These institutions were established to help farm youth learn how to live full lives, complete lives, *on the farm*.

But the land-grant colleges have come a long way since Lincoln's day. How far they have departed from the aims of their founders can be seen in their 1944 report, which preached the philosophy heralded by some groups in the United States Department of Agriculture, the philosophy of the factory farm, one of the basic tenets of which is that *fewer* people should be urged to stay on the farm. My own personal experience while attending conferences during the past few years at a number of land-grant colleges convinces me that there is a universally concentrated activity in the schools of agriculture to bring about a tremendous decline in the rural population.

Of course the report met with much criticism. A meeting was held at Notre Dame University in September, 1945, to discuss the question. Dr. Noble Clark, Director of Extension at the University of Wisconsin, the chairman of the committee that drew up the report, was invited to defend it against the criticisms.

Dr. Clark uttered the same doleful warning one often

hears from agronomists these days: "Don't buy a farm unless it is fertile soil and you have plenty of money." What kind of national policy is this, anyhow? The crying need is to induce ambitious young folk to take rundown farms and rebuild them. It is the same course that has made many great fortunes in business and industry. It is not only good business—it is patriotic service for our country—for posterity. We need more manpower on the soil, not less. Our topsoil is fast flowing down the streams. What a shame it is that such magnificent demonstrations of the traditional American spirit, of intelligent farming and the rehabilitation of small farmers by their own initiative, independent of government paternalism, are not sponsored by the agricultural colleges!

The agricultural land-grant colleges, in too many instances, are failing to take the lead in the development of hybrid seeds useful to the family-sized farm, leaving this to commercial concerns. They are negligent in the development of labor-saving machinery for farm chores, such as inexpensive milking machines for a one- or two-cow dairy, silos that can be used for one or two or four cows, and so on. They may be doing good work for consumers of farm products, but it is not very good work for farmers. As Roger M. Kyes aptly says, "Big farms produce crops but small farms produce men." Our farm colleges need reorientation. They should encourage people to live on the farm by showing them how to live on a farm—how to make use of nature's rich bounty to make a good living, relatively independent of vast commercial specialty operations. As a matter of fact, of course, when this approach is followed, the result is to make more money for the farmer than when the specialty cash crop course is adopted. In a period of farm boom the bonanza farmer makes a lot of money. But in the long run these periods are few and of short duration. Over the period of a farmer's working life, it is the family farmer, on the average, who makes the best living.

In our land-grant colleges, too much stress is placed on the earning of money incomes and too little on realizing the values of wholesome family life. The function of education at these institutions seems to be to teach people to go out into the world and make a career of teaching more people to be teachers. Placement bureaus concentrate on putting agricultural students into high-priced jobs, as if money incomes were the only criterion of success.

One middle-western agricultural college furnishes an alarming example of the failure of such an institution to fulfill its obvious function—to train men and women for farming. A graduate of this college conducted research which disclosed the amazing fact that only 7.7 per cent of the 219 graduates in the class of 1941 went back on farms, though most of them came from farms. In the department of field crops and soils, there were only 287 graduates between 1904 and 1938, and of these, only twelve are now farming. It has been remarked aptly that there are more graduates from the state university now engaged in farming than from the state agricultural college.

A graduate of that institution gives this reason for the paradox:

Boys coming to this college get bluffed out. They see only big, expensive installations and the general attitude and atmosphere is such that they think farming is no use unless they have \$10,000 to \$25,000 as capital. They hear lectures and study texts that point only toward big herds and big, expensive equipment. Some of the professors tell them not to go on a farm unless it is fertile and first class.

The best thing such a college could do would be to establish, right on the campus if possible, or near there, a forty-acre farm on which a man with small capital—a man of the share-cropper type—is making a living. There is such a farm—a demonstration farm—not fifty miles from the campus; it isn't sponsored by the agricultural college but by a far-sighted *city chamber of commerce*. The man on this place took a worn-out, abandoned farm—a sorry-looking place—consisting of about forty acres of scrubby timber and forty acres of plowland. He started \$200 in debt. Now, after seven years, his net worth is \$4,500. He now has three children. He has livestock, poultry and implements and is living very

comfortably. He did it by emphasizing the live-at-home diversification system, as contrasted with extensive commercial operations. This isn't an isolated case, either. I can cite many others of the kind. Soil conservation was a keystone in his program.

A survey by the United States Chamber of Commerce shows that 60 per cent of our people have only an eighth-grade schooling or less. In one state, Pennsylvania, it has been found that the cost of training an agricultural graduate is approximately \$2,500. The cost per student for general college training throughout the United States ranges from \$1,000 to \$10,000. Only 10 per cent of our people have passed through these institutions of higher learning. We are spending a large part of our educational budget on a fraction of our youths. For this reason, there is need for a comprehensive re-examination of educational needs in the United States. The present system of agricultural education is inadequate; it does not serve the interests of farm youth or of the nation. We need to discover how to develop a system that will serve both these interests.

Easton, Pa.

American Newspapers Through Two World Wars

By NEIL MACNEIL

I

TWO WORLD WARS have had a profound influence on the American press. The widespread and intricate newsgathering problems that had to be solved hastened the maturity of American journalism. Today our reporters and editors, by and large, deal with world problems with more assurance and competence than they did at the time of Sarajevo, and our readers have more understanding of the clashes in the economic and political affairs which produce those problems.

Reporters, editors and publishers, on the whole, have risen to the demands made on them by the changing situation. They have had to educate themselves first before they could do an adequate job for the public. Improvement in the volume and quality of news coverage in the newspapers of the United States has been steady since the summer of 1914. Evidence of this maturity on the part of the press can be seen in a quick survey of news coverage over the past three decades. For contrast, compare your favorite newspaper today with page one of *The New York Times* of June 27, 1914, the morning before the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand and his wife at Sarajevo. (I choose *The Times* only because it is readily available to me. Any other serious newspaper would do as well.)

Were it not for the masthead, the reader of today would have difficulty in recognizing that issue of *The Times*. The leading story on page one was about an intercollegiate boat race on the Hudson River, in which Columbia won. For *The*

Times that was the major news in a world that was about to explode. The other featured news on page one was equally unimportant. There was a story about one of the perennial revolutions in Mexico, one about the political fortunes of Theodore Roosevelt, and one about the recent receivership of Claflin's store. The rest of the page was devoted to "shorts," mostly human interest and crime stories. Among these "shorts" were two European items. One told in nine lines about the King of Italy honoring the Italian manager of the Piccadilly Hotel grill in London with a knighthood. The other reported in ten lines the deaths of two German fliers.

Next day, June 28, 1914, *The Times* had a four-column head on page one on the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand and his wife, perhaps because the editors remembered the mystery surrounding the death of his predecessor, Archduke Rudolph. The editors of *The Times*, like other American editors, were ignorant of the political implications of the assassination and gave no hint of the terrible consequences that were to follow from the event. The assassination was treated as an isolated story, complete in itself, much like an ordinary murder story.

Before the start of World War I, American editors, like the American people, were concerned almost exclusively with American news. They had devoted most of their energy and thought to telling the story of the building of the United States—in itself one of the greatest news events of all time. Local news (often crime reports) and community, State and national political items made the featured stories. The police reporter and the political observer were the "star" contributors. A murder story was considered major news; the ablest members of the staff would be turned loose on it, and the editors would give it sensational display.

The influence of Joseph Pulitzer and William Randolph

Hearst was dominant in the majority of newspaper offices. Lurid photographs and large-type headlines were the usual thing. The comic strips and the news syndicates had just come into their own. Journalists were not above a bit of faking or exaggeration to "improve" a story. Editors wanted novelty. Many publishers were more interested in circulation wars than in accurate news. Competition in this field was savage.

About this time Adolph S. Ochs was struggling to build up *The New York Times* on the basis of objective and complete news coverage—a field that he had almost entirely to himself.

II

FOREIGN NEWS was carried in most newspapers; but it did not get adequate treatment and seldom did it get important display. Often it had a foreign slant, due to the way in which it was covered. Few American journalists were competent to deal with foreign news, although the news agencies and some of the larger dailies had bureaus in Europe. The correspondents generally received proofs from some foreign newspaper, and the news agency operated in collaboration with foreign news agencies, some of which had news monopolies in their territories.

The reports about France would be colored by French interest and the news of the United Kingdom by British interest. The affairs of the British Empire, except Canada, were covered from London, and those of the French Empire from Paris. Thus the American press could have only the news of these important areas which was made available to the British and French readers, all of it written from an imperial viewpoint.

Besides this, much of the foreign news in the American press was unimportant. It rarely dealt with serious issues,

for the American public was not interested in such things, and American editors and reporters were not trained to deal with them. Foreign wars were treated like sporting events, the news story often going no deeper than the immediate strategy or tactics of the opposing generals. The doings of emperors and kings and princely and noble families were exploited to gratify a curious quirk of American psychology, or perhaps to show Americans what they were missing. The significant movements in intellectual thought, the progress of science and the arts, the larger economic trends, the needs and problems of the people were almost entirely ignored. There was no American interest in them.

III

THE SUDDEN OUTBREAK of World War I on a continental scale found American editors poorly equipped to deal with a story of such magnitude. Moreover, few of them had any conception of the real issues involved. Fortunately they did realize that it was one of the biggest news events of all history and had to be covered as such. The newspapers and agencies that had bureaus in London, Paris and Berlin soon discovered that they were not adequately staffed for the job now imposed on them. Still worse, few newspapers in the United States had reporters at home who could be sent to Europe to write intelligently on the war and its problems. But the need for immediate action was imperative.

So the American press turned to the British and French press for help—chiefly to the former. For instance, *The New York Times* arranged with *The London Chronicle* to share the cost and the output of its correspondents, who included Sir Philip Gibbs. Other newspapers made deals with other London papers—*The Times*, *The Morning Post*, *The Daily Express*, *The Daily Mail* and *The Daily Telegraph*. This was

not a satisfactory way of covering the events, for it meant that the news would have a British flavor, written as it was by British correspondents for the British public. But it was the only thing that could be done at the moment.

Of course American newspapers got the bulk of the news from their own agencies, but these in turn still worked in close co-operation with, when they did not depend on, foreign agencies, most of which were subsidized by their governments and were instruments for national propaganda.

Meanwhile, American magazines, as well as newspapers, rushed staff men to Europe, to both the Western Allies and the Central Powers. Richard Harding Davis represented a syndicate headed by *The New York Tribune*. Frederick Palmer represented *Everybody's Magazine*; Irvin Cobb, *The New York World* and *The Saturday Evening Post*; Will Irwin, *Collier's* and *The American Magazine*; John T. McCutcheon, *The Chicago Tribune*; and Arno Dosch, the *World's Work*. *The New York Times* had Cyril Brown in Berlin, *The World* had Edwin Emerson there, and *The Brooklyn Eagle*, Henry Suydam. Almost all of these men, however, were feature writers and did not, or could not, write day-to-day "spot" news.

Lord Kitchener did not help matters for the Americans when he decided that only one American correspondent could go with the British forces to France. Palmer, a magazine writer, was chosen. Later these restrictions were relaxed, but the difficulties experienced in covering the news were many. After the United States entered the war, the American Expeditionary Forces were accompanied by able, if inexperienced, American reporters, and our writers got better facilities on all Allied fronts. Edwin L. James represented *The New York Times* at Allied Headquarters, in a press contingent that included Floyd Gibbons and Damon Runyon. They set a new pattern for war reporting.

From the outset both the Allies and the Central Powers engaged in propaganda campaigns in the United States to enlist American support. So far-reaching and so powerful were these efforts that as early as September 9, 1914, *The New York Times* called it a "press agent war." The British struck a powerful blow at the Germans when they cut the cables from Germany to America. This left only the carefully censored English cables to relay news to the United States, for the wireless was still young and inadequate.

IV

HITHERTO, FEW AMERICAN journalists, if any, had considered the United States in terms of world power. True, they had been surprised a decade and a half before at the ease with which we had defeated Spain. But the majority of Americans, and almost all foreign observers, recognized that this defeat was due as much to the weakness and ineptitude of Spain as to the strength of the United States. Despite the imperialism of Theodore Roosevelt, most Americans were still isolationists, and favored limiting our foreign policy to the Monroe Doctrine in the Americas, the Open Door in China and the Far East, and no entangling alliances in Europe. Basically our policy was to keep Europeans out of the Americas and Americans out of European affairs. The press reflected this thinking.

So it was both a shock and a surprise to many American editors to find their country being drawn irresistibly into the European war. Gradually the American press had turned to the British and French against the Central Powers. A poll taken by *The Literary Digest* three months after the start of the war showed 240 leading American editors neutral, 105 pro-Ally, and 20 pro-German. After the sinking of the "Lusitania," six months later, almost the entire American

press had turned against the Central Powers. The nation and its press were almost unanimously behind Woodrow Wilson when he called for a declaration of war.

It was not until the United States had mustered much of its manpower and industrial strength behind the Allied cause that the American press came to the realization that this country was one of the great world powers. Even then most editors were reluctant to admit that this involved new responsibilities. They recognized that the war had to be won and won quickly, but much of their thinking was done in terms of the old isolationist America.

Wilson's messages, statements and speeches made a deep impression on the newspapers at the time, but not all editors had any idea of their implications. While ready and willing to win a war to "make the world safe for democracy," and to fight a "war to end all wars" they had slight conception of the problems that would follow in its wake and of the difficulties of peace. A few newspapers did, and they fought hard for the cause of peace. The majority did not.

The fighting of World War I, the peace conferences, and the political battles that followed in the United States all helped to broaden the vision of American editors. Many of them learned of certain old international problems for the first time. Many of them came to know of America's intimate relations with the rest of the world, and of our dependence on world peace for our own national peace and prosperity. American correspondents in the field began to write with more understanding and authority. Some editors had training in foreign policy. Others became specialists in foreign news.

The long and bitter fight over ratification of the treaties in the Senate and the partisan political campaign that ensued helped further in this process of education. Misrepresenta-

tion, however, was common both in the press and on the political platform. The Republicans, led by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, brought to the Senate hearings every dissatisfied and dissident minority group in the country and encouraged them to air their grievances. These were spread on the front pages of the press. The idealism of the war was soon forgotten, and a selfish, calculating cynicism took possession of the country. This, in turn, was reflected in the press. After the national election of 1920 and the defeat of Wilson's ideals, the bulk of the press returned to isolationism.

V

FROM THE BEGINNING of World War I, Washington had taken on major news importance. This was greatly increased with our entrance into the war. From the night when President Wilson addressed Congress, a steady flood of news flowed from the national capital, much of it of international significance. Then, again, foreign developments often had repercussions in Washington which had to be reported.

The news agencies as well as the more important newspapers had to enlarge their Washington bureaus. No longer could one or two men do the job for a newspaper. Reporters had to be on watch at the White House, in the departments of State, War, and Navy and at the Treasury. One or more had to cover Capitol Hill—the Senate, the House and the many Congressional committees. The might of the American people was being mustered from Washington and much of their government was being centered there, a trend that has continued until the present. The previous trickle of news from the national capital had become a rushing river, and much of this news was important and complex.

The coverage of the war and the peace changed the stress on news in the American metropolitan dailies. Local crimes

and ward politics ceased to be as vital to news editors as they had seemed to be before. Despite the spirit of isolationism at home, most editors found that they could not go back to the kind of news they had served their readers before the war. Many continued to be conscious of international news and gave it prominent display. All gave more space to national affairs. Some editors were definitely conscious of America's responsibilities in a troubled world.

During the war certain newspaper men were worried about what they would use for news after the negotiation of peace. They could not visualize what would make news in the years ahead. I remember a discussion late one night on the war desk of *The New York Times*. The edition that had just gone to press had stirring news from Europe and Washington. An old editor asked, "What are we going to do for news when this is all over?"

There was a moment of silence, and then the head of the desk remarked, "Oh, we will find something. We always do."

There has never been a shortage of important news since. The ending of the war and the signing of the peace treaties did not end the problems of the world; in fact many of them became more acute. The newly established Communist régime in Russia, inflation, hunger and despair in Germany and Austria, the general strike and other difficulties in Great Britain, the Sinn Fein revolt in Ireland, the civil wars and fighting in China, the efforts of the League of Nations to deal with a distraught world, and our own many problems at home made vital and interesting news that commanded the attention of editors and their readers.

VI

DESPITE THE EFFORTS of many Americans, and some editors, in the 1920's to limit their attention to American affairs, it

was impossible to return to the old news formulas. The war had changed their world and they had changed with it. These were fantastic days in America—"the age of beautiful nonsense," as Westbrook Pegler called it. Americans did many foolish things just to make news, like the dance marathons and flag-pole sitting stunts. Again there were attempts to feature sordid murders as major news. Many great athletes—men like Babe Ruth, Jack Dempsey, William T. Tilden and "Bobby" Jones—helped to make sports news interesting. Yet the American people and their editors could not ignore the tragic events abroad. We could not be happy in our false prosperity while millions were starving in Europe.

Serious editors at this time expanded the scope of news. The discovery of the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen was displayed on page one of many newspapers, and archaeology became news. The flight of Charles A. Lindbergh to Paris was treated as one of the greatest stories of all time. Other flights to Europe and over the poles were exploited. Editors sent reporters to cover the conferences of scientists, philosophers, medical men and economists. The Einstein theory was explained on page one of *The New York Times*. Things that had never before been considered news suddenly became important and intrigued readers.

Editors soon found that the scope and complexity of news had expanded beyond the competence of the general staff reporter. This led to the development of the news specialist—the man who could deal with complicated, special fields in simple terms that the average reader could understand. Some of these were schooled on the staffs of the newspapers and news agencies; others were hired from outside occupations for their knowledge, and later trained in newspaper techniques.

While the staffs of different newspapers and news agencies

necessarily varied according to the problems that each had to solve, the corps of specialists covered a wide range. Besides the general reporters and district men to deal with straight local news, and the rewrite men handling all types of news, most of the larger newspapers and news agencies employed specialists to write news of science, labor, education, courts, politics, ships and shipping, railroads, aviation, automobiles and highways, radio and wireless, military and naval affairs, religion, society, women's clubs and activities, transit and other public utilities, parks and playgrounds, museums and art, music, the theatre, motion pictures, the dance, contract bridge and other games, stamps and other hobbies, and what not. In Washington, bureau specialists dealt with foreign policy, government finance, agriculture, labor, business, tariffs, currency, taxes and other subjects. Still further, the city editor or the news editor could call upon the services of the specialists operating under the business, finance and sports editors, where the division of labor and specialization were even more elaborate.

Again, the great depression and the New Deal expanded news interests and further complicated news problems. More specialization became necessary. The economic and social revolution sponsored by President Franklin D. Roosevelt changed the thinking of millions of Americans, and American news editors had to deal with another type of news. Gold movements, foreign exchange, banking, international credits, business cycles, reparations, foreign debts, economic cartels abroad and monopolies at home, trade restrictions, housing, relief, unemployment, minority rights, child labor, union labor and its rights, collective bargaining, maximum hours and minimum pay, and a score of other similar economic and social problems became page one news and had to be written, edited and displayed intelligently.

VII

MEANWHILE during the 1920's and 1930's there was a tremendous growth in speedy communications. The radio, the automobile and the airplane along with the telephone and the telegraph made drastic changes in the life of Americans and in their thinking. All these served also to make the world smaller and to destroy American isolationism. The developments in communications combined with the steady growth in public education stimulated American curiosity in a thousand things that were of no interest before and opened up new fields for editors and reporters to explore.

The conquest of time and space also revolutionized journalism itself. It changed editorial concepts. Instead of thinking in terms of the local community, the editor had to think in terms of the nation and the world. His daily budget of news covered all activities of consequence or interest to Americans wherever they took place on the globe. The story that broke in Tokyo, Moscow, or Rome would be on the streets of New York, Chicago, or San Francisco a few hours later. As Americans heard more than ever before of such matters and such areas, the news had to be written and edited to bring out its true significance and to make it intelligible to all readers. Often a picture of the event would accompany the news story. The editor could not take days to deal with such stories; they had to be reported in hours at the most, sometimes in minutes.

Still another complication in the gathering and presentation of world news was the rise of new political systems in Europe and in Japan. American reporters and editors had difficulties with the news of the Soviet Union from the start, for the iron curtain is not new in Russia. In their efforts to bring the truth to the American reader, correspondents often went wrong, but this was almost entirely due to Russian restrictions on the gathering of the news and to censorship.

Few American editors realized the significance or direction of Fascism when it first appeared in Italy, and some of them could be embarrassed today by quoting from their editions of twenty years ago. An editor himself, Benito Mussolini made a favorable impression on many American correspondents as well as British editors. This was reflected in the American press.

American reporters in Europe, encouraged by their editors at home, did a masterly job of informing the world of Hitler's program. A score of able men and women risked their very lives to obtain the truth and to get it through censorships. Some of these worked for newspapers and some for news agencies. They reported the exact facts of his repressions within Germany, of his alliance with Mussolini, and later with Japan. They did outstanding reporting on the series of events that led from the conquest of Austria, the Munich Conference, the occupation of Czechoslovakia, the pact with Stalin, to the invasion of Poland and the opening of World War II. American journalism had come of age. American editors were ready to cover the news anywhere, and to spread the truth before their readers.

VIII

WORLD WAR II was a broadening experience for American journalists as well as their readers. The global scope of the fighting, the many economic and social problems involved, the long lines of communication introduced places and peoples that had only been names to Americans before, and brought conditions and problems to their attention that they had never dreamed existed. Islands in the Pacific, ports in the Mediterranean, countries in the Near East, Asia, and Oceania, rivers and cities in Eastern Europe and Russia became as familiar to Americans as their neighboring village. The

cutting off of our supplies of rubber and tin and spices in Malaya and the Netherlands Indies made new difficulties for the people of the United States and proved our dependence on other countries. The grievances of the people of India, lack of transport in China, the petroleum areas of Iran, the shipping on the Danube, and innumerable other problems suddenly became matters of deep concern to officials in Washington and to American newspapers and their readers. Correspondents and editors had to keep close to their maps and their reference books to know what it was all about. The correspondent had to be briefed as well as the commander of the B-29. The education of the news editor was unending. For the first time editors realized that this was a small, closely integrated world.

Despite the self-imposed censorship at home and the many censorships at the battlefronts and in all belligerent countries, and the numerous other difficulties in covering the news of the war, the American press made an outstanding record in reporting it. This job was not confined to military and naval operations, for the war entered into all phases of life in all the countries of the globe. Old institutions passed away; historic structures were destroyed; ancient and honorable people were persecuted; and all over the world there were problems of economic distress, hunger, ruin and disarrangement. All the sciences were mustered into the fighting, with the major contribution the atom bomb. Nothing escaped, and everything the American press reported. It was total war involving everything, everywhere.

Right now American reporters and editors are dealing with the problems of the peace. They are covering the conferences of the foreign ministers of the Big Four wherever they meet—in London, Paris, New York, or Moscow. They are reporting the deliberations and the disputes in the United

Nations Council, in the Assembly, and in the numerous committees. They are watching the operations of the new World Bank and of UNRRA. They are keeping their readers informed on the perplexing problems of readjustment and recovery in France, Italy, Belgium, Denmark and other nations. They are reporting the strife in China and the administration of General Douglas MacArthur in Japan. They are giving the facts daily about the Four Power rule of what is left of Germany and the Germans. And despite restrictions, they are giving much accurate information of developments in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and the Soviet Union itself.

The difficulties of reporting the aftermath of the war and the making of peace are as troublesome as were those of the war. Perhaps they are worse. But no matter what they are or what they may become, American reporters and American editors will handle them with the greatest competence they have ever known. They have learned much in the past thirty-two years. It is not easy to fool them now; and it is not easy to keep the truth from them. When they get the facts, they print them.

The American press has its faults. No one who knows it will deny that. While it has matured in the past third of a century of strife and trial in world affairs, it is still developing. It can never reach perfection, for the simple reason that reporters and editors are human and cannot know everything. While they have learned a lot, they have much yet to learn. The encouraging fact is that they learned a great deal in two world wars and are still willing to learn more. With all its faults the American press brings more of the truth to its reading public than does the press of any other nation.

New York

Only on the maintenance of individual rights can the life of society prosper. The prosperity of the few in a society which in nearly all its actions denies natural rights to the millions will not save political democracy or personal property any more than high-sounding phrases will save well-known public men from the stigma which seems to have been hurled at them. Natural rights must be considered.

FRANCIS NEILSON

Pope Pius XII, Apostle of World Peace*

By DONALD A. MACLEAN

TRUTH, JUSTICE AND POLAND are the major victims of our second World War. To appease our ally, Russia, we sacrificed Truth, Justice and Poland. We went to war to liberate Poland from tyrannical aggression, to defend the fundamental European liberties and to preserve Christian civilizations. An "unconditional surrender" victory saved none of these. Even before victory we renounced most of these original objectives. Our unconditional surrender of Poland to Soviet aggression, massacres, and total enslavement represented but one stage of a progressive national, moral deterioration, which culminated in repudiation of our original moral objectives and their replacement largely by those against which we originally revolted. And so, today, justice and truth, like the millions of homeless, naked, starving, dispossessed peoples, seek—amidst rubble that recalls the glorious, priceless Christian heritage of centuries past—a place on which to rest.

Exulting in pride of victory, and blinded by imperialistic greeds and hatreds, leaders of major world powers shortsightedly seek, in materialistic ideals and principles, foundations upon which to establish the peace, order and well-being for which millions sacrificed their lives and for which mankind ardently craves.

Peace or another world war awaits our decision as to the fate of Truth, Justice and Poland. The fate of Europe, our fate, and the fate of humanity hang in the balance. Shall we revive our original objectives, shall Christian truth and justice be given a fair chance to demonstrate their regenerating power, shall the glorious, vitalizing spirit of Christ, the Prince of Peace, be allowed to revitalize an almost extinct civiliza-

* Copyright, 1946, by Donald A. MacLean.

tion, or shall our leaders be permitted to render nugatory all the blood, sweat, tears and sacrifice of mankind? Shall the common people's hopes be foully betrayed? Shall alien materialistic principles and forces, which spell the complete doom of civilization and mankind's total enslavement, triumph?

I

THROUGHOUT WORLD WAR I, but one commanding figure stood out and above the current clashes, greeds and confusions, clearly pointing the road to mankind's regeneration and rehabilitation, the road to genuine peace. While many leaders recognized the sanity and virtue of the remedial program of Pope Benedict XV, hatreds, greed and injustices were allowed to prevail. We paid for our indifferences and blindness with a world depression and the agonies of another world war.

Today, as during past centuries, the Church, through its head, Pope Pius XII, calls mankind to the Way, the Truth and the Life which alone will guarantee to humanity that peace for which all crave. As an apostle of genuine world peace Pius XII challenges world leaders and peoples to give Christianity a fair chance in the rebuilding of a new, democratic and peaceful world.

Pope Pius XII may quite properly be regarded as the outstanding social and political reformer of the twentieth century. As the leading apostle and crusader of our day for genuine and lasting peace he challenges the attention of all peoples, Christian and pagan. By his many world messages, letters, broadcasts and personal contacts, during the war, Pius XII kept alive the moral conscience of humanity and stimulated in the hearts of men an ardent desire for world peace, based on truth, justice, charity and mutual trust. Stalin and Hitler both recognized in him their most formidable and implacable opponent and consequently vented on him their persistent ire. Peoples, hungering for real freedom

and security, regard Pius XII more and more as mankind's greatest friend. No more valiant champion of genuine democracy exists anywhere today.

The peace program of Pius XII is the most realistic, most comprehensive and thorough-going yet advanced anywhere. At the same time it is both radical and revolutionary in that it envisages the repudiation of most of the currently accepted materialistic principles and institutions and their replacement by others radically different. In it, he provides for a complete program of social and political reorganization, universal in scope, rooted in a thorough-going reform of the human person. This new order embraces within its sweep every social institution ranging from the single family to that of the great family of peoples.

Recognizing in the human person the subject, foundation and end of all social order, Pius XII rests his new global order on an ontological basis, which, starting with God, ends with man, and beginning with man ends with God. His program calls for a complete reformation of society in all its usually accepted phases. Human nature, the natural moral law, the common well-being and perfection of all members of the great human family, linked with God the Creator and end of man, form the four stable compass points within which his social and political reform revolves. From the new life, new light and new law of Christ, the Prince of Peace, the social and political program of Pius XII derives such life, virility and dynamic spirit as to merit truly for his reformed society the title of a new world order.

Before the outbreak of World War II, Pius XII warned world leaders of the futility of trying to resolve world problems by resort to force. "Nothing is lost with peace," he asserted, "all may be lost with war." How barren our military victory is, becomes daily more evident. Total military victory has not brought peace to the world. None of the great

objectives for which we fought and sacrificed has been achieved. The blood, sweat, and tears of humanity have failed to bring, liberty, security and order to a scorched and distressed world.

The cry, "Give us peace," wells up from the agonized hearts of peoples, and resounds throughout the world. But there is no peace in the world. Nations and peoples seek in vain for the breathing spell needed to heal their wounds, to rebuild their broken bodies and calm their tortured souls.

A two-fold famine threatens the life of mankind. A quarter of the world's population hungers for bread. The promptings of humanity urge us all to make great sacrifices to save our fellowmen from starvation. A second famine, even more serious, more widespread and more difficult to control encircles the earth. Mankind hungers and clamors for peace, but in its place peoples are offered the stones of suspicions, fears and envy, and the dead sea fruit of greeds, rivalries and hatreds. Heavy fogs of suspicion, black enough to hide the face of God, enshroud the secret processes of peace-making.

For Pius XII a two-fold immediate objective presents itself. First, the world famine must be met with all available resources. Sharing of foodstuffs and clothing with the peoples of the scorched and devastated areas is, he insists, an immediate and compelling moral duty on all peoples. The rehabilitation and housing of the millions of unfortunate victims of war is also urgent. Especially is this a grave duty for the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, and particularly for the people of Canada, the United States, Brazil and Argentina, blessed as we are by God with abundance. We must not forget that the peoples of the earth form but one family in God. As brothers we must share our goods with them and give aid, especially to those in grave need.

Second, the primary task of peace-makers, asserts Pius XII,

is to put an end to the criminal war game. A world perpetually organized for war can never bring peace. It is especially urgent that the danger of a clash between the major powers be avoided. This calls for mutual understanding, intelligent co-operation and a large measure of good will from all concerned. The demobilization of the war forces, especially of the great powers, must be carried through with promptness on the conclusion of peace treaties with the partners of the Axis nations.

But besides meeting these two urgent and immediate demands a much more difficult and comprehensive task confronts humanity. We are called upon to "build upon the accumulated ruins of war a new edifice of fraternal solidarity among men."¹ As Pius XII pointed out at the termination of the European war, "The major task of this hour is to rebuild the world." All peoples must plan and strive, he urged, "for a new and better Europe and a new and better world."

Fully convinced that the stupendous task of building a new and better world could not be realized unless the primacy of the spiritual were assured, Pius XII undertook to "blaze a trail towards a better future, one more secure and more worthy of mankind," than any so far attempted. Realization of true peace in a new world order, he noted, demands the sincere and energetic co-operation of all peoples. Consequently he urged that "All should dedicate themselves to the work of reconstruction of a new and better world, founded on filial fear of God, on fidelity to His commandments, on respect for human dignity, and on the principle of equality of rights for all peoples and all States, large and small, weak and strong."²

II

FORGETFULNESS OF GOD is the fundamental cause of the ills and crises that are today devastating the world and distressing humanity. Repudiation of the moral law in economic, social,

¹ Pius XII, Easter Message, April 13, 1941.

² Pius XII, Address to the World, May 9, 1946.

national and international affairs inevitably engenders social disorder and confusion. Order and peace among men can exist, as Pius XII noted shortly before the outbreak of World War II, "only if God everywhere occupies the place which is proper to Him,—the first."³ Only when God, the Creator and Father of all peoples and nations, holds His due primacy in human thought and action everywhere, can real peace generate and develop in the family of nations. For religion alone can provide mankind with the ideals, the basic principles, the global pattern and the unifying, vitalizing spirit essential to such a dynamic world order as will ensure for all peoples true, enduring peace and well-being. Victors and vanquished alike must turn to Christ, the Prince of Peace, if the world is ever to enjoy the blessings of real liberty, security, tranquility and happiness. Never did the world need the Gospel of Christ's truth, justice and love more than today. Yet, because of our lethargy, we have permitted Christ to be dubbed a neutral, and consequently excluded from the peace-building process.

A counterfeit or "phony" peace will inevitably result from current exclusion of God and the principles of Christian truth, justice and charity from the world's councils. "A new and true (world) order is not possible without raising our eyes to God." Devoid of religion, peoples become an easy prey to destructive social and political contagions that necessarily breed and perpetuate social chaos and international crises. Peace is not to be found, Pius XII notes, "under the auspices of those who would banish from the earth the reign of Christ, substituting brute force for divine guidance." A people or a nation which fosters irreligion, class struggle, class hatred, and class domination must ever be regarded as an effective and vicious champion of disorder. While communistic forces with their Fifth Column tactics are everywhere on

³ Easter Message, April 14, 1939.

the march, bent on extending the frontiers and domination of Soviet Russia, all hope of an ordered and peaceful world must ever remain a dream. You cannot do business with Communism, any more than with Nazism or Fascism, in building a free world order or lasting peace.

As there can be no peace without order, so there can be no order without law. Current forgetfulness or repudiation of the natural law has engendered everywhere much confusion and conflicts in economic, social and political life. "The radical and ultimate cause of the evils in modern society is," Pius XII asserted, "the denial and rejection of a universal form of morality, as well for individual and social life as for international relations."⁴ Restoration of harmony and peaceful intercourse among nations is impossible without observance of the principles of international natural law. "The new order of the world, of national and international life, must rest no longer on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards that depend only on the selfish interests of groups and individuals. No, they must rest," the Pope continues, "on the unshakable foundation, on the solid rock of the natural law and the Divine Revelation."⁵ Consequently, as Benedict XV declared during World War I, "The first and fundamental basis of a just and lasting peace should be the substitution of moral force of right for the material force of arms."⁶

Failure of world statesmen to accept this principle and reconstruct world order on its basic pattern has been mainly responsible for the conditions that led to World War II. Another World War is inevitable should we permit our leaders to build a peace structure which ignores the basic moral foundations essential to world order. Nations and their rulers must govern and be governed by God's law, if peoples are to

⁴ *Summi Pontificatus*, Oct. 20, 1939, para. 23.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 75.

⁶ "Peace Message to the Warring Nations," Aug. 1, 1917.

enjoy peace in a democratic world. Any other course spells national suicide, international autocracy and anarchy. The social and national interests of the common people and of Christianity are basically identical. Both bore the major brunt of war and both should play a major rôle in the formulation and creation of world peace. As long as both continue to be excluded from the peace-making processes there will be no genuine world peace.

III

CHRISTIANITY alone brings to man true world concepts of a sound and progressive social order. For the Christian, all races and nations form one great family under God. No matter what be their color, race, condition or religion, all peoples, as descendents of the original parents, Adam and Eve, are members of the one human race. Created by God, redeemed by Christ, all peoples, as children of one Heavenly Father, form one body in Christ, and as members one of another should collaborate for the well-being of all.

The universal unity and solidarity of mankind is a fundamental truth both of the natural and supernatural order. It is the basic, essential idea and reality underlying world society. Widespread forgetfulness and rejection of the law of human solidarity and of the mutual bond of charity, dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of our rational nature, have undermined and shattered the indispensable foundations of world order. Resulting deep-seated cleavages are more fatal to world peace than the atomic bomb itself.

The world order of peace through truth, justice and law must be vitalized by a new dynamic spirit of unity and solidarity which, fostering mutual co-operation and sacrifices, will ensure the common welfare of all men. Forces that are to renew the face of the earth should issue primarily from within, from human spirits ennobled and fired with light and

zeal, emanating from the Eternal Spirit of Truth and Love. The world today is torn by discord, divided by selfishness and poisoned by hate. Humanity's reservoir of good will is well-nigh exhausted. The spirit of mutual trust and generous fraternal co-operation essential to a united tranquil world is lacking. As Pius XII emphatically predicted, peace based on revenge gets nowhere. As long as nations are fired with the passions of war there can be no hope for world peace.

Purging of hates, greeds, rivalries and desires for domination can only be affected by virile ideas and forces that emanate from Him, Who alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life. Regeneration of spirits, so essential to human welfare and the creation of a new world order, must be grounded on truth, actuated by justice and crowned with charity. Our most urgent task, asserted Pius XII, is "to build upon the accumulated ruins of the war, a new order of fraternal solidarity among the peoples of the world."⁷ That unity of peace and well-being for which all men crave can be attained only by restoring the God of Peace and Love to the hearts of men and nations.

Confidence or mutual truth is the very life breath of society. This is especially true of world society. Its absence has a paralyzing effect on international intercourse. Under Christ's benign influence, resentments, rivalries, hatreds and greeds among peoples will give way to mutual love, trust and concord. The corroding bitterness of class warfare and national hatreds will be replaced by a constructive spirit and by the forces of mutual co-operation. Guided by social justice and social charity the social activities of all peoples will be directed toward that higher common good so essential to human welfare, personal perfection and happiness.

No real world order or genuine peace can be realized as long as peoples and nations refuse global extension to the Good

⁷ Easter Message, April 13, 1941.

Neighbor Policy. The "Good Samaritan" and the "Good Neighbor" are the best citizens in any society, be it national or international. World leaders should realize, as Pius XII, the outstanding champion of genuine democracy urged, that we must build democratic souls, if democratic States and a democratic world commonwealth are to be established.

The great human family, asserts Pius XII, forms a true world society, a world commonwealth. In reality it is but the natural development of the original family created by God. As the primary and essential social cell, the family is one of the main cornerstones of the world order. It conditions all human relations. It is the cradle of civil society, wherein the character and destinies of States are prepared. A State that fails to safeguard its homes and to foster its family-life undermines both national and international order. For the Christian family alone brings to the State and to the world society that social outlook, vitality and dynamic force which make possible lasting peace and orderly world progress.

The perfection of family life and of the world society is also bound up with the widest possible diffusion of property ownership throughout the world. Family holdings are closely associated with family well-being. The progress of present and future generations as well as world peace is conditioned not only on ample family wages but also on a wide extension of private property ownership.

Genuine social democracy demands that the natural right of the family to vital space, to a home or adequate housing be fully recognized. Social justice insists that industry, agriculture and finance function, not for a few, or for the majority, but for the welfare of all. It requires that the widest diffusion of private and co-operative ownership, in every sphere of economic life, be fostered by national and international policies.

Genuine social democracy under the guidance of Christian

justice assures to laborers, not only ample family wages, but also due share in the management, profits and ownership of major industries. Besides, as Pius XII declared, Christianity insists that women in industry are entitled to the same wages and equality of treatment for the same work as men. Through the application of Christian social justice and social charity, democratic co-operative control and development of the world economy will promote the unity, solidarity and common welfare of the whole community of nations.

For Pius XII, the future progress, welfare and peace of the world hang on recognition of the unity and organic solidarity of the family of nations and peoples. As the Holy Father declared in his first Encyclical message to the world, "The human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth, directed to the good of all nations, and ruled by special laws which protect its unity and promote its prosperity."⁸ The intrinsic unity and welfare of the family of nations is in no way impaired by the existence of its constituent, autonomous organs. For it is, he asserts, "a disposition of the divinely sanctioned natural order that divides the human race into social groups, nations and States, which are mutually independent in organization and in the direction of their internal life." Through the recognition of this Christian human solidarity, and by loyal adhesion of all peoples and nations to God's law, peoples can best free themselves from the meshes in which war greeds and hatreds have engulfed them. Men must choose between democratic freedom, based on Christian, moral principles, or enslavement under materialistic totalitarian autocratic rule.

IV

FUTURE WORLD PROGRESS, welfare and peace hang on the establishment of sound world government. The World Com-

⁸ *Summi Pontificatus*, para. 65.

monwealth, states Pius XII, should "be vested by common consent with supreme authority to smother in its germinal stage any threat of isolated or collective aggression." While each State "retains an equal right to its own sovereignty—the authority of such (World) society," he asserts, "must be real and effective over member States."⁹

A primary function of world government is to ensure international order and to promote the common well-being of all peoples. This includes protection of weaker States and minority groups, against aggression or imperialistic domination. The Christian new world order fosters due regard for the natural rights and interests of all its constituent members. This guarantees, Pius XII states, full "recognition of the right to life and independence of all nations, regardless of their size or strength."¹⁰

The barbarous conduct of one of our major allies—Soviet Russia—with regard to many of her neighbor States finds no parallel in history. Neither can her atrocious conduct find a sanction either in the moral or international law. Behind an iron curtain which blacks out half of Europe and Asia, men and nations are ground under the ruthless heel of totalitarian tyranny. Millions of lives have been ruthlessly extinguished because they dared to hold fast to the faith of their ancestors. Other millions faced firing squads or Siberian enslavement because they believed in a democracy which assured them of their rights to political, economic and personal freedom.

Proud Baltic nations have sunk from sight like stones dropped into a bottomless lake. Poland, in whose defense the British Commonwealth entered the war, Yugoslavia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and even Czechoslovakia, bespoiled and stripped of their national dignity and independence, are compelled to endure the harsh minority rule of puppet gov-

⁹ "On Democracy," Dec. 24, 1944.

¹⁰ Christmas Message, 1939.

ernments, imposed on them by the menacing forces of Soviet Russia. This continued aggressive domination over half of Europe, and Soviet enslavement of these peoples, while continued, must ever destroy all hopes for a truly peaceful and democratic world. Communistic enslavement of nations, even though with the secret or public connivance of the "Big Three" nations, ever spells the doom of world order or of a united peaceful Europe. Approval of such injustices by Russia's allies can in no way legalize or justify imperialistic enslavement of any nation. But the enslavement of Poland must ever be regarded as especially reprehensible. Whether done by Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia, it matters little. World history will ever record our inglorious betrayal of gallant Poland, our first European ally, to Soviet Russia's imperialistic demands.

A Christian world commonwealth alone insists that due regard must be given to the natural rights of its constituent elements. Never can it condone unilateral violation of treaties or aggressive violation of a nation's frontiers. As frequently urged by Pius XII, the new world order demands above all, "recognition of the right to life and independence of all nations."¹¹ Hence the life of one State must not be sacrificed in the interests of any powerful nation. All States possess the same fundamental rights and each has a far-reaching natural, mutual rôle to play in the promotion of peace and in the creation of a progressive new world.

That the world society may function as an effective instrument of international unity and world peace, it must be endowed with actual governmental jurisdiction, *i.e.* legislative, executive and judicial powers. While all such authority is grounded on and limited by the natural law, and by the common welfare of the society of peoples, yet it must not be regarded as merely a delegation of part of the sovereign author-

¹¹ *Ibid.*

ity of the various States. Of itself the world commonwealth possesses real inherent superior authority over the member States. This includes power to enact laws as well as authority to enforce their observance with proper sanctions where necessary. Above all, such world organization, Pius XII asserts, should "be vested by common consent with supreme authority and with power to smother in its germinal stages any threat of isolated or collective aggression."¹²

Claims to absolute autonomy by many States, and even to totalitarian power, involving imperialistic oppression of neighbor States, constitute the main threat today to world unity, order and peace. Peace and democracy cannot thrive in a world half enslaved and half free. Furthermore, the idea that conceives of the world society as an absolute or totalitarian State is equally abhorrent to sound reason and Christian philosophy. Enslavement of peoples and nations will inevitably follow adoption of either of these patterns of world order.

World concerns ought not be monopolized by any nation or small group of nations howsoever powerful. The remaking of the map of the world is not exclusively the function of the major exponents of power politics. We have not endured long years of war horrors and sacrifices to reap the bondage of totalitarian tyranny. Much of the fruits of victory may be lost to humanity through the "Big Three" grab of that international authority which by natural right belongs to all members of the world society. Along with the "veto right" claimed by the big powers, this constitutes a fatal stab at the heart of global unity and genuine peace. Domination by a powerful nation or by a bloc of nations over a number of nations or over the world can never create the true democracy for which the peoples of the world hunger. It spells imperialistic enslavement rather than a just, democratic, free new world order.

¹² "On Democracy," Dec. 24, 1944.

Christianity demands that the national and international life of peoples be organized on a realistic global peace basis. "The primary task of peacemakers," asserts Pius XII, "is to put an end to the criminal war game." While major nations persist in military conscription and armament races there can be no real world peace. Instead of preparing for war, all States must organize effectively and realistically for peace. If we really desire to end war, we should first of all renounce the cult of might. Peoples "must repudiate forever with profound horror the idolatry of power."¹³ Force must be harnessed to right and become its faithful servant. We cannot gain peace through expediency and might, while sacrificing the demands of truth, justice and charity.

Progressive reduction everywhere of national military armaments, and their replacement by juridical peace organizations backed by an international police force, is a primary condition to the making of real peace. But disarmament is not enough. The constructive forces of the world must be organized and function—nationally and globally—to assure everywhere the triumph of right, benevolence, and law over aggression and might. In this mighty task, world organizations have a far-reaching constructive rôle to play. Success or failure of such efforts is conditioned on the acceptance or rejection of the universal principles and ideals of the natural law and Christian morality. Our continued repudiation of Christian principles will inevitably plunge mankind into another and more catastrophic world war. That tragedy today seems inevitable.

That this tragedy be averted and the vestiges of tyranny be effectively banished from the face of the earth, the problem of ignorance, of moral illiteracy and of counteracting false and vicious propaganda must be overcome. Press and radio are the two most influential forces in the world today. The

¹³ Pius XII, *On Reception of French Ambassador to the Vatican*, May 10, 1945.

power of the press and radio to promote genuine peace and real democracy has most emphatically and favorably been noted by Pius XII on numerous occasions. Freedom of information and communication of truth are basic natural rights of all men. A controlled, venal or sycophantic press and radio, coupled with military might, are the main arms of autocracy. A vigorous, free and independent press—the champion of truth—is the world's greatest medium of popular education. Without its support no true democracy or civilization can survive or progress. Totalitarian dictatorships and autocracies fear the exposing light of a free world press. They know that they cannot survive the atomic shock of exposure to regenerating truth.

V

BUT NO SOCIAL PROGRESS or lasting peace can be hoped for unless Christian charity and fraternal love for all peoples, joined with a virile spirit of justice, establish and actuate all social and juridical institutions necessary for national and world order. It is chiefly, says Pius XII, "by repudiating and disowning charity [that] the world has lost true peace."¹⁴ Men must again become conscious of the fact that genuine civilization as well as true peace can only stem from Christ and His law.

A new spirit of charity, the very soul of a new world order, must take root and develop in all peoples. Above all, a generous spirit of good neighborliness must dominate and actuate those whose power, resources and opportunities make them more influential and impose on them greater responsibilities for the furtherance of world peace. This is especially true of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. The nations of the "New World" have a major rôle to play in the current world confusions and crises. Europe and Asia look mainly to us to

¹⁴ Pius XII, Address, March 13, 1940.

save them from the further ravages of hunger, "more destructive to life and morals, even than war itself."¹⁵ For the peoples of the world hungering also for real democracy and permanent peace, the peoples of the United States, Canada and Latin America are, under God, their main hope. We must not fail mankind in its greatest two-fold crises. As victors, as Canadians, as Americans, and especially as Christians, we have been entrusted by God with a trusteeship for the whole human race. Never must one forget that, as Leo XIII stated, "the blessings of nature and of grace belong in common to the whole human race."¹⁶ No greater service could Canadians, Britons and Americans confer on mankind than to provide virile Christian leadership for building, on the sure foundations of truth, social justice and social charity, a realistic peace and a better world for all.

But the creation of true global peace requires not only the sincere and energetic "collaboration of all Christendom" but also the "co-operation of all humanity." As Pope Pius XII declared in his Christmas message of 1945, "The present hour calls imperiously for collaboration, good will and reciprocal confidence in all peoples." The peace that will bring relief, liberty, security and true happiness to a distressed world must first spring from hearts of people inspired with a spirit of fraternal love, mutual trust and genuine co-operation. It is to the Heart of Christ, the Prince of Peace, that we must look for such guidance and vitalizing spirit. Once the Holy Father uttered a prayer in which we all ought to join: "May it please our Divine Redeemer, from whose lips went forth the cry, Blessed are the peacemakers, to enlighten those in power and the leaders of the world. May He direct their thoughts, sentiments and their deliberations. May He give them in body and in soul the vigor and strength to overcome obstacles, lack of

¹⁵ Herbert Hoover, "Report to the American People," May 17, 1946.

¹⁶ *Rerum Novarum*.

trust and the dangers that lay strewn on the path of those who would prepare and achieve a just and lasting peace."¹⁷ May we all play a sublime and providential rôle in creating a Christian New World Order which will inaugurate a new era of fraternal reconciliation, of peace, prosperity and happiness everywhere among all peoples.¹⁸

*Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.*

¹⁷ Sept. 1, 1943.

¹⁸ [This essay is based on an address delivered June 30, 1946, in celebration of the centennial of the Catholic diocese of Victoria, British Columbia, the diocese from which the author is on loan to the Catholic University of America.—EDITOR.]

[Nihil Obstat. Imprimatur. JOHN C. CODY, Titular Bishop of Elatea].

Democracy in the American Tradition

By T. SWANN HARDING

OF THE MANY who discuss the subject, it is a rare few, indeed, who ever bother to scrutinize what we are wont to call Democracy. *What is the essential American tradition insofar as it can be discerned intellectually?*

The answer to that question requires a look into history. What were the basic trends of thought of the oft-quoted and frequently misinterpreted Founding Fathers, as expressed in their speeches and writings? Can the thread of this thought be discerned as it comes on down to our own time?

A little study reveals that this thought had half a dozen or so outstanding characteristics. Naturally things have changed. Some of the matters that so deeply interested or disturbed the Founding Fathers have lost significance. Some problems have disappeared.

Nevertheless it is remarkable that so many questions which agitated them assume importance today. This is given added emphasis when we consider that our country stands in a chaotic world and is itself beaten by many diverse winds of strange and, it seems, alien doctrines.

Fear of Monarchy

DISTRUST OF MONARCHY was powerful among early Americans. This was perhaps not so characteristic of Alexander Hamilton as of Thomas Jefferson. George Washington distrusted monarchy rather less because he appears to have anticipated its inevitable return in America. Nevertheless there was much outcry against forms and ceremonies that were regarded as monarchical.

Great fear was also expressed about continued re-election of Presidents. Jefferson especially considered this a most

dangerous precedent. While it is a fact of historical record that Washington retired from the Presidency as a matter of expediency, and because his estates urgently needed his personal attention, Jefferson retired after his second term as a matter of sacred principle and sought to establish a precedent. There is no evidence that Washington sought to establish such a precedent.

Writing to James Madison, Jefferson said, in criticism of the newly-proposed Constitution:

The second feature I dislike, and strongly dislike, is the abandonment, in every instance, of the principle of rotation in office, and most particularly in the case of the President. Reason and experience tell us, that the first magistrate will always be re-elected if he may be re-elected. He is then an officer for life. This once observed, it becomes of so much consequence to certain nations, to have a friend or a foe at the head of our affairs, that they will interfere with money and with arms.¹

In a letter to David Humphreys,² Jefferson was still of the same opinion. He still thought that the President should be perpetually ineligible instead of perpetually re-eligible for election. However, three states out of eleven had declared against his theory, so he reluctantly said "we must suppose we are wrong," since the majority should rule.

Hatred of Monopoly

SECONDLY, THE FOUNDING FATHERS greatly feared monopolies, though many leading citizens, who form the nucleus around which organizations of superpatriots elaborate themselves, have viewed them with such sympathy as deeply to revile any who would regulate them. Yet Washington so hated monopolists, and what he regarded as privileged classes, that he once angrily exclaimed:

It is much to be lamented that each state, long ere this, has not hunted them down as the pests of society and the greatest enemies we have to the

¹ From Paris, Dec. 20, 1787.

² From Paris, March 18, 1789.

happiness of America. I would to God that one of the most atrocious in each state were hung in gibbets upon a gallows five times as high as the one prepared by Haman.

Washington's friend Jefferson was somewhat milder and somewhat less in favor of lynchings. But he wrote Elbridge Gerry: "I sincerely believe, with you, the banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies."³ Writing Madison regarding the new Constitution,⁴ Jefferson said: "The saying there shall be no monopolies, lessens the incitements to ingenuity, which is spurred by the hope of a monopoly for a limited time, as of fourteen years; but the benefit of even limited monopolies is too doubtful, to be opposed to that of their general suppression."

Obviously if the mere monopoly a patent gave an individual aroused Jefferson's apprehension he would have opposed the great unregulated monopolies of later times. Daniel Webster carried this philosophy a little further when he said: "The freest government cannot long endure when the tendency of the law is to create a rapid accumulation of property in the hands of a few and to render the masses poor and dependent." The late Calvin Coolidge restated this tradition when he held⁵ that "The Government of the United States is a device for maintaining in perpetuity the rights of the people, with the ultimate extinction of all privileged classes."

Distrust of Law

THIRD, DISTRUST OF LAW was a fundamental part of early governmental theory in the United States. Disrespect for law was not only countenanced; it was advocated. The broad form of this doctrine occurs in Thoreau's words: "It is not desirable to cultivate respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation I have a right to assume,

³ Jan. 28, 1799.

⁴ From Paris, July 31, 1788.

⁵ In a speech in Philadelphia, Sept. 25, 1924.

is to do at any time what I think right." Surely the vigilantes would also have deported Thoreau.

Writing on law to William Johnson,⁶ Jefferson said:

Laws are made for men of ordinary understanding, and should, therefore, be construed by the ordinary rules of common sense. Their meaning is not to be sought for in metaphysical subtleties, which may make anything mean everything or nothing, at pleasure. It should be left to sophisms of advocates, whose trade it is, to prove that a defendant is a plaintiff. . . .

Naturally Jefferson feared and distrusted the Supreme Court. Yet he wrote the following to Madison:⁷

The instability of our laws is really an immense evil. I think it would be well to provide in our constitutions, that there shall always be a twelve-month between the engrossing a bill and passing it; that it should then be offered to its passage without changing a word; and that if circumstances should be thought to require a speedier passage, it should take two-thirds of both Houses, instead of a bare majority.

Usurpation of Power

JEFFERSON AND HIS FOLLOWERS felt that there was great danger in usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and its ultimate dictatorship. Writing to William Johnson,⁸ the aged statesman said:

. . . There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our government by the noiseless, and therefore unalarming, instrumentality of the Supreme Court. . . . I must comfort myself with the hope that the judges will see the importance and duty of giving their country the only evidence they can give of fidelity to its Constitution and integrity in the administration of its laws; that is to say, by every one's giving his opinion *seriatim* and publicly on the case he decides. . . . The very idea of cooking up opinions in conclave, begets suspicions that something passes which fears the public ear, and this, spreading by degrees, must produce at some time abridgment of tenure, facility of removal, or some other modification which may promise a remedy.

⁶ From Monticello, June 12, 1823.

⁷ In a postscript to a letter from Paris, Dec. 20, 1787.

⁸ From Monticello, March 4, 1823.

It will be remembered that Jefferson was President when the famous *Marbury v. Madison* decision was rendered by John Marshall. Writing to William Johnson⁹ about three years before his death, Jefferson reviewed this case, though his aged memory tricked him once or twice. He was still concerned about the manner in which justices of the Supreme Court blandly "advanced beyond its constitutional limits." He accused John Marshall of making many extrajudicial statements in his opinions and then went on:

This practice of John Marshall, of travelling out of his case to prescribe what the law would be in a moot case not before the court, is very irregular and very censurable. I recollect another instance, and the most particularly, perhaps, because it in some measure bore on myself. Among the midnight appointments of Mr. Adams, were commissions to some federal justices of the peace for Alexandria. (District of Columbia?) These were signed and sealed by him, but not delivered. I found them on the table of the Department of State, on my entrance into office, and I forbade their delivery. *Marbury*, named in one of them, (and several others?) applied to the Supreme Court for a mandamus to the Secretary of State, Mr. Madison, to deliver the commission intended for him. The Court determined at once, that being an original process, they had no cognizance of it; and therefore the question before them was ended. But the Chief Justice went on to lay down what the law would be, had they jurisdiction of the case, to wit: that they should command the delivery. The object was clearly to instruct any other court having the jurisdiction, what they should do if *Marbury* should apply to them. Besides the impropriety of this gratuitous interference, could anything exceed the perversion of law? For if there is any principle of law never yet contradicted, it is that delivery is one of the essentials to the validity of a deed. Although signed and sealed, yet as long as it remains in the hands of the party himself, it is *in fieri* only, it is not a deed, and can be made so only by its delivery. In the hands of a third person it may be made an escrow. But whatever is in the hands of the executive offices is certainly deemed to be in the hands of the President; and in this case, was actually in my hands, because, when I countermanded them, there was as yet no Secretary of State. Yet this case of *Marbury* and *Madison* is continually cited by

⁹ June 12, 1823.

bench and bar, as if it were settled law, without any animadversion on its being merely an *obiter* dissertation of the Chief Justice.

This ancient brand of Americanism discouraged rather than inculcated respect for law, as evidenced by Thoreau above. Emerson not only wrote that "hence, the less government we have, the better—the fewer laws, the less confided power," but also: "Every actual State is corrupt. Good men must not obey the law too well." During the Mexican War it was Theodore Parker, no less, who declared: "I think lightly of what is called treason against a government. That may be your duty today, or mine."

Fourth, John Adams as well as Founding Fathers Washington, Hamilton and Jefferson vastly distrusted the common people. When they spoke of democracy they did not, any of them, mean the "rabble." Writing to John Melish,¹⁰ Jefferson said that George Washington was neither Federalist, separatist, Angloman, nor monarchist. "He sincerely wished the people to have as much self-government as they were competent to exercise themselves." But Washington differed strongly with Jefferson on only one point: "I had more confidence than he had in the natural integrity and discretion of the people, and in the safety and extent to which they might trust themselves with a control over their government."

Washington, therefore, was not especially democratic. Jefferson, in turn, was distrustful of all who worked in manufacturing. While he would have been willing to extend the power of the vote to many agriculturalists who would have been denied this by others, he felt manufacturing so degrading to man that workers in factories could scarcely be regarded as competent human beings.

Security of Property

YET JEFFERSON HELD property sacred, though he did change

¹⁰ From Monticello, Jan. 13, 1813.

the expression to "pursuit of happiness," in writing the Declaration of Independence. The ideas of the American Revolution centered around property as the key to happiness. Locke and Rousseau were its apostles. As William Kay Wallace puts it: "Locke's principle that government exists to secure property, and Rousseau's doctrine that men are born equal in the sense of being endowed with equal rights to 'life and liberty,' were combined in the popular mind so as to form a single principle, tersely expressed in the American Declaration of Independence as the 'pursuit of happiness.'"

Adams held to the philosophy of "natural aristocracy." Those mentally equipped to rise would become leaders in any society no matter what its restraints. Oddly enough, modern biology and genetics confirm the half-truths behind this dogma. Children of different genetic heritage are known to react utterly differently to the same training, environment, and opportunities. It is known also that the inherent intellectual capacity of an individual cannot be very greatly increased by any known means of mental training at any period of mental development.

Differences in school children are now known to be due to a greater extent to differences in inherited nature than to differences in environment and educational opportunity. Some will achieve under the same circumstances which leave others in doltage. It goes against the grain to believe that all men are not born equal, but it is genetically true nevertheless. Of course, personality is the result of the interaction of heredity and environment.

Possibly Washington also had an inkling of the fact that there would be many more dolts than persons of achievement. In any case, he was himself singularly distrustful of democracy. We have Jefferson's word for this and Jefferson knew Washington as well as any man. Writing to one Walter Jones,¹¹ Jefferson gave a résumé of George Washing-

¹¹ On Jan. 2, 1814.

ton's character as he understood it. The following words are extremely important:

He has often declared to me that he considered our new Constitution as an *experiment* on the practicability of republican government, and with *what dose of liberty man could be trusted for his own good*; that he was determined *the experiment should have a fair trial*, and would lose the last drop of his blood in support of it. And these declarations *he repeated to me oftener and more pointedly*, because he knew my suspicions of Colonel Hamilton's views, and probably had heard from him the same declarations which I had, to wit, "that the British constitution, with its unequal representation, corruption and other existing abuses, was the most perfect government which had ever been established on earth, and that a reformation of those abuses would make it impracticable government." *I do believe that George Washington had not a firm confidence in the durability of our government.* He was naturally distrustful of men, and inclined to gloomy apprehensions; and I was ever persuaded that a belief that we must at length end in something like a British constitution, had some weight in his adoption of the ceremonies of levees, birthdays, pompous meetings with Congress, and other forms of the same character, calculated to prepare us gradually for a change which he believed possible, and to let it come on with as little shock as might be to the public mind.

Note the words underscored by the present writer. George Washington was far from democratic. He looked with much distrust upon democratic processes. Only in later days did he come around to sound Americanism. In his Farewell Address he said:

The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government. . . . If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.

Distrust of Government

OBVIOUSLY IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT to define either the government or the constitution in static terms. Vigilante oaths are hence absurd insofar as they pretend to bind anyone to past beliefs about such instruments. Indeed no less a

dignitary than Washington expressed great distrust of government, a fifth doctrine of the Founding Fathers, saying, in 1785: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force! Like fire it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master; never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action." Thoreau naturally would go further for he was an anarchist. He it was who declared:

I heartily accept the motto—"That government is best which governs least"; and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which I also believe—"That government is best which governs not at all"; and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments sometimes, expedient.

Woodrow Wilson adhered strictly to this basic philosophy when, in an address to the foreign-born in Philadelphia,¹² he said: "You have just taken an oath of allegiance to the United States. Of allegiance to whom? Of allegiance to no one unless it be God. Certainly not of allegiance to those who temporarily represent the Great Government." In another address,¹³ he said: "Liberty has never come from government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of the limitations of government power, not the increase of it."

Hence, from the standpoint of superpatriotism, such persons as Washington, Thoreau, Emerson, and Wilson should have had their treatment with traditional tar and feathers, and then should have been beaten, jailed, and, if possible, deported. But worse is yet to come. The "Essential American Tradition"—the phrase was once used by Jesse Lee Bennett as a book title—not only countenanced, but advocated, open rebellion. Citizens were encouraged to rebel against

¹² March 10, 1915.

¹³ To the New York Press Club, Sept. 9, 1921.

what they regarded as bad government, even to destroy it by violent revolution if that seemed necessary.

In 1774 Samuel Adams declared that when the people thought their rulers had prostituted the power entrusted to them, and were oppressive and subversive, instead of supporting a free constitution, "they are no longer to be deemed magistrates vested with a sacred character, but become public enemies and ought to be resisted." Thomas Jefferson, writing to David Hartley in 1787, greeted news of a recent insurrection in Massachusetts with much satisfaction.

Writing Madison¹⁴ the same year, Jefferson said:

I own, I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always oppressive. It places the governors indeed more at their ease, at the expense of the people. The late rebellion in Massachusetts has given more alarm, than I think it should have done. Calculate that one rebellion in thirteen states in the course of eleven years, is but one for each state in a century and a half. No country should be long without one. Nor will any degree of power in the hands of government, prevent insurrections.

This close friend and confidant of George Washington wrote even more emphatically to Judge Tyler in 1804:

God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion. The people cannot be all, and always, informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such circumstances, it is a lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty.

The Constitution of the State of Maryland (1776) actually advocates armed revolt against bad government in these words: "The doctrine of no-resistance, against arbitrary power and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind." William Ellery Channing in 1812 declared: "So far is the existing government from being clothed with an inviolable sanctity, that the citizen, in particular circumstances, acquires the right, not

¹⁴ From Paris, Dec. 20, 1787.

only of remonstrating, but of employing force for its destruction."

Abraham Lincoln, addressing the first Republican convention in Illinois in 1865, said: "This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people that inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember and overthrow it." How did we attain today's effete condition in which we regard a constitutional amendment as in bad taste, affect to look up to the Supreme Court as infallible, and view armed rebellion against bad government with horror?

Changes in Fundamental Law

SUPERPATRIOTISM as well as adoration of the existing Constitution were always suspect. Curiously enough, those arch enemies, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, were in closer agreement about such matters than most people today are aware. Hamilton held¹⁵ that "people have the right to alter or to abolish the established Constitution whenever they find it inconsistent with their happiness." Jefferson declared¹⁶ that "no society can make a perpetual constitution or even a perpetual law." He went on that any law or constitution expired naturally in about thirty-four years; its enforcement thereafter amounted to an unjustifiable act of force.

In denouncing alien and sedition acts Madison made it plain also that, had sedition acts forbidden attacks upon the existing government in the days of the Confederation, the United States might still have languished under that inept form of government. Webster not only said "Repression is the seed of revolution," but also tolerantly held that quite other forms of government than ours might exist elsewhere,

¹⁵ In *The Federalist* in 1787.

¹⁶ In a letter to Madison in 1789.

and that that preference should be enjoyed by other peoples free from molestation.

According to Merle Curti,¹⁷ conservative elements among the Founding Fathers also believed in the revolutionary principle. This belief had an English background. The doctrine of the necessary overthrow of tyrannical kings and governments formed part of the philosophy of Natural Rights. Hamilton declared that the people, if betrayed by their representatives should exert their original rights and overthrow the usurpers.

John Adams confided in his diary in the year of Dan Shays' rebellion that a revolution is one of the strongest proofs of the virtue and good sense of a people though he later qualified this by saying that revolutions must never be undertaken rashly or without deliberate consideration and sober reflection. Madison, another leader of reactionary or conservative forces against attacks on property interests during the post-Revolutionary period, declared that the people "have an indubitable, inalienable and infeasible right to reform or change their government, whenever it may be found adverse or inadequate to the purposes of its institution."

The Lost Right to Revolt

JEFFERSON'S VIEWS are indicated above. Daniel Webster held that the people may overthrow their government if they choose to do so. In debate with Hayne he said that while civil institutions were established by peoples for public benefit, "when they cease to answer the ends of their existence, they should be changed."

Lincoln declared that people everywhere had the right to rise up and shake off existing government and form a new one if it suited them better. Indeed, he remarked that "any portion of such people that can, may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit."

¹⁷ "Our Revolutionary Tradition," *Social Frontier*, December, 1943.

Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft did not follow this traditional attitude, however. Its last statement was made by President Woodrow Wilson when he upheld the right of revolution at San Francisco in 1919. By 1921, thirty-four States had made advocacy of violent overturn in government a penal offense,¹⁸ and so passed another fundamental doctrine of the revered Founding Fathers. Today "The Revolution" is something long past to which even venerable members of the Daughters of the American Revolution may refer with pious and devotional sanctimony. It has no place in our current thinking as it had in that of our forefathers.

We live in a country whose tradition also favors unqualified freedom of expression, unlimited respect for free inquiry and liberal education, and absolute tolerance for opposing opinion. Only thus can the democratic process function. Evidence for this tradition is so overwhelming and prolific we can do no more than skim it.

We might begin with Thomas Paine's aphorism: "He that would make his own liberty secure, must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent which will reach himself." Jefferson, writing to William Charles Jarvis,¹⁹ held: "I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education."

The Rights of Free Speech and Free Inquiry

J. A. ANDREWS, an early governor of Massachusetts, said:

I care not for the truth or error of the opinions held or uttered, nor for the wisdom of the words or time of their attempted expression, when I

¹⁸ The Supreme Court has held, however, that such advocacy must constitute a present danger to the government or public order to be punishable by law.

¹⁹ Sept. 28, 1812.

consider this great question of fundamental significance, this great right (of free expression) which must be secure before free society can be said to stand on any foundation, but only on temporary and capricious props.

In his first inaugural address Lincoln voiced his own Americanism by saying: "A government had better go to the very extreme in toleration than to do aught that could be construed into an interference with or to jeopardize in any degree the common rights of citizens." The early American scientist, Thomas Cooper, who died in 1839, held that "no doctrine, of whatever nature it be, or whatever its tendency, ought to be suppressed. For it is either manifestly false, or its truth is dubious." If true it must be made operative. If false it convicts itself without suppression. But if dubious then only the freest possible discussion can establish its true value.

Channing held:

The progress of society depends on nothing more than on the exposure of time-sanctioned abuses which cannot be touched without offending multitudes, and on the promulgation of principles which are in advance of public sentiment and practice and which are, consequently, at war with the habits, prejudices, and immediate interests of large classes of the community.

To this sentiment Wendell Phillips added his voice:

How shall we ever learn toleration for what we do not believe? The last lesson a man ever learns is that liberty of thought and speech is the right for all mankind; that the man who denies every article of our creed is to be allowed to preach just as often and just as loud as we ourselves.

We detect here an echo of the doctrine so long attributed to Voltaire but so far not found in his writings: I disagree absolutely with what you have to say but shall defend to the death your right to say it freely. In modern times this classic doctrine has often been embodied in the opinions of leading American jurists. Judge Augustus Hand, in the case of Max Eastman, held it the right of every citizen freely to express

his opinions about the Great War, about this country's participation therein, about the desirability of making peace, the demerits of conscription, or the claims made by conscientious objectors to war.

This held true, Judge Hand said, even when these opinions "are opposed to the opinions and policies of the Administration; and even though the expression of such opinion may unintentionally and indirectly discourage recruiting and enlistment." Judge Pound, in a "Red" case, used the doctrine, saying: "Although the defendant may be the worst of men; although Left Wing Socialism is a menace to organized government; the rights of the best of men are secure only as the rights of the vilest and most abhorrent are protected."

Charles Evans Hughes, speaking of the ouster of the Socialist assemblymen from Albany in 1920, said: "It is the essence of the institutions of liberty that it be recognized that guilt is personal and cannot be attributed to the holding of opinion nor to mere intent in the absence of overt acts." We should expect Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes to espouse the doctrine with his own tincture of wit which he did, saying: "With effervescing opinions, as with the not yet forgotten champagne, the quickest way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to air." In many opinions, of course, he advocated freedom of expression.

The Essence of Americanism

WHAT THEN ARE THE ESSENTIALS of traditional Americanism, if we may presume to judge it as expounded by leading American citizens from the time of the Revolution on? They appear to be somewhat as follows:

There was strong distrust of monarchy and it was rather generally felt that Presidents should not be re-elected. Monopolies and privileged classes should be abolished. There should be as little government as we can possibly get along

with, and as little respect for law as can be contrived without relapse into open anarchy. The common people were not to be trusted; rule should really be in the hands of a sort of intellectual aristocracy.

It would not be a bad thing at all if the people rebelled against government by force every now and then, staged a new revolution as needed by new generations, and set up a government more pleasing to them. This involved the afore-said distrust of government generally. In fact it was suggested that the Constitution be constantly readapted to new needs, and be completely revised by each new generation which felt that necessary.

Finally, it was held that there should always be unqualified and unlimited freedom in the expression of opinion by every means, and regardless of its character. This involved extension of the most liberal education possible, and the establishment, preservation, and utilization of the spirit of free inquiry, which were thought to be the sole agents capable of promoting proper functioning of the democratic process.

Is this something to tie to? It is about what we get when we consider the deliberate opinions of those who best represent the essential American tradition. Is this sufficient bulwark against the incursions of communistic or totalitarian ideals of government? How many good average Americans are really acquainted with the basic philosophic beliefs and traditions underlying their system of government? Familiar and unfamiliar statements of great Americans have been given here to acquaint them with this tradition.

Washington, D. C.

Liberalism and Individual Liberty

By ASHLEY MITCHELL

A THRILL WAS SENT through the whole world when President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States, and Winston S. Churchill, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, signed the Atlantic Charter. People said: "If we are going to work on the basis of the Atlantic Charter we shall see something restored which badly needs restoring in public life—we are coming back to the principles of moral truth." Up to 1914, up to the outbreak of the first world war, British politics were based on something like principle. At any rate, the issues were plain and the ordinary man could understand them. The conflict was between reform and privilege. The progressive party stood for reform and the other party stood in defense of privilege, and even worse, in favor of reaction.

But latterly the issue has been utterly confused. The principles of the Atlantic Charter are all but forgotten. In fact, to paraphrase Sam Weller's words, it would need something like a double million-power microscope to distinguish the difference between the programs of the Labor, Conservative and Liberal parties in Great Britain; they are so confused and their proposals are so much alike.

We of the Liberal party in Great Britain must reiterate constantly that there is a major, unique and vital principle in Liberalism—the liberty of the individual. There is no country more than Britain which can claim to be the champion of freedom and democracy. I recall a broadcast (reported in the *Manchester Guardian*) by the Vichy Radio after the battle of Stalingrad, when the tide had begun to turn and the people of France were beginning to hold up their heads. The Vichy Radio said that the people of France must not expect

to be freed by the Liberalism of Britain. Why did Vichy react in this way to the turn of events? Because the whole world and especially the continent of Europe regard Britain as the defender of Liberty and Freedom.

What do we see now in the homeland of Liberalism? What we see is something like a disease, people clamoring on every side for State control, only varying in the degree of intensity with which they would apply that principle. The same disease runs through every political program. All the programs are based on authoritarianism—they are based on the very principle against which we fought. Because a proposal is advocated under the guise of paternalism does not alter the fact that it derives from authoritarianism. There is nothing new in paternalism. It has never solved the social problems, because it has always been based on authority, never on democracy. It leads to the adoration of the State and involves the subordination of the individual. These ideas of paternalism, of State control, are put forward by people who in their proposals suggest that they are going to tamper with the foundations of our livelihood. When people ask us to bow down and worship the State, and at the same time prepare to play ducks and drakes with the very system on which our strength has been built, it is time for us to wake up.

In the little island of Britain a population of 45,000,000 has been maintained only because of one fact—that it has had open ports. Winston Churchill stated that fact boldly in a political broadcast when he was Prime Minister. He reminded the people that if it had not been for the cheap food policy Britain should never have had a population of 45,000,000, but one more like 15,000,000 or 20,000,000. Britain would have been only a little country like Belgium or Holland. The Prime Minister himself, titular leader of the Conservative party, told us that Free Trade is the very basis of our livelihood.

Do not forget the great changes that Free Trade brought about. It is about 100 years since the dreadful "hungry forties." Lord Macaulay then warned people of tender susceptibilities to keep away from the industrial districts of the Midlands where could be seen such misery, suffering and poverty—to a degree that we hope we never more see in Britain.

Some of the latest proposals suggest that Britain's trade in future must be controlled. Now we in Britain did not question that controls were necessary during the war. But these people tell us that we are to be subject to the same controls in the future. If that is so, then we can look out for those terrible times again, because we cannot maintain our population unless trade is restored. We must get Free Trade and see the tariffs we had before the war abolished—and we must do this no matter what other countries do. As T. Atholl Robertson has said, other countries may struggle along with their burden of tariffs if they choose, but there is one country that *must* have Free Trade and that is Great Britain.

Any country that establishes tariffs is instituting also a degree of inflation in its prices. Every tariff country is of necessity a country of inflated prices. When one compares the cost of living, one has always to inquire whether the country under study is a tariff country or not. The reason why Britain was successful in international trade while the rest of the world was staggering behind was because Britain maintained open ports. We in Britain did not artificially increase prices by tariffs and our costs of production were kept as low as possible and we bought everything as cheaply as possible. That is the only way to maintain strength, and that strength made us regarded as one of the great countries of the world. We must get back to it.

But it is not enough merely to institute Free Trade. While it is primarily true that Free Trade was the cause of the

strength and prosperity of Great Britain out of all recognition compared with only one hundred years ago, there is still the social problem to solve. Wealth is still unequally distributed. Society still is composed of people who are richer than they ought to be and people in poverty. The late John Hilton says in his last book:

There has been no marked trend away from the inequality that existed before 1914, and up to 1938 the gross inequality still existed.

When one mentions the fact of the extremes of riches and poverty, then some people seem to think there is no need for further argument and that paternalism is the remedy. What we must do, they say, is look after the poor. I suggest that the fact does not prove that at all. It simply proves that something fundamental ought to be done to change the condition. We have to go to the root of things. That is—abolish the poor. That is a bold statement. But we have to aim high. We can do it. And when it is done, then paternalistic ideas will fall into their proper perspective. Provision for the aged and unfortunate will be simple and not burdensome.

But instead of going to the root of things, the advocates of paternalism and controls come along with proposals to spend millions here, millions there and millions somewhere else, as if there were a bottomless pit of money available to the State. These people think they have made a wonderful discovery to take the place of such a pit. They say: "It doesn't matter what size the debt is—the money is all in the family." How useful that idea would have been to Louis XVI, when the people came to him complaining of the burden of taxation! It is certainly an easy way out to introduce schemes for spending countless millions, as if the debt did not matter. Some of the proposals suggest that all we need do is set the printing presses to work—they lead to nothing else but inflation.

No Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to take such a complacent view of these schemes. He will have to tackle the job of raising the funds. When he is being pressed for the schemes, he will reply: "Then we cannot afford to abolish the purchase tax; we cannot abolish the tariffs and have Free Trade, because I need revenue." That would be his position because the country had saddled itself with so much unnecessary expense.

We need Free Trade and something else—Land Reform. Winston Churchill, back in 1910 when he was a Liberal and a land reformer, set the case out very clearly when he said:

At the moment when our opponents are forging new chains of monopoly for national industry, Liberals are prepared to break the old chains which have long oppressed the national land. Land Reform and Free Trade stand together. They stand together with Henry George, with Richard Cobden, and they stand together in the Liberal policy today.

What is the Liberal party in Great Britain doing about this policy today? Compromise! It ought to have insisted upon the policy it has preached all these years. Look at the record of the Liberal party since 1889 with regard to the taxation and rating of land values. This policy was confirmed at the great Newcastle Conference of 1891 and constantly reaffirmed since then right up to 1939. The traditional argument of the party was that the way to deal with the land question is not by control but by taxing away the unimproved value of the land. You would break land monopoly and make land easier to get. By collecting the land values created by the community, you could abolish the taxes on trade and consumption that cause poverty and unemployment. You would break these boom crises.

When we talked like that in Great Britain, the common man—who is no fool—knew that we meant business. But when we talk the same sort of thing as the other parties, he doesn't see why he should bother with us. If we went out

and preached the same militant radicalism as before, we would get the same support. The Liberal party never won a general election in Britain on paternalism. Lloyd George with his insurance scheme was no exception—that issue was advanced after the previous general election. The last general election when the Liberals came to power was in 1910 (there were two elections in that year) when we were fighting for things the people understood—Free Trade and the breaking of land monopoly—and we were facing up to the House of Lords. The people knew then that we were in earnest.

We are now told that giving employment is not an essential liberty. If we are to believe that there shall be no inherent right to give employment, then it necessarily follows that a man has no inherent right to take a job except with the State. I wonder if the British Liberal party is going to go into the agricultural districts to tell the farmers they have no inherent right to employ a plowman? We are told that private enterprise will break down unless it is rigidly controlled. But private enterprise is not breaking down. We have never had it fully. The benefits we have had came from the partial private enterprise we were able to secure after the break-up of the medieval system. But we have only had it for the favored few. We can never say that private enterprise has been a failure when we never gave it a thorough trial. When we allow a few people to take the value of public improvements and keep land out of use, it is ridiculous to pretend that private enterprise has ever had a chance.

But in all this talk of State paternalism there is even something worse involved. In some quarters "Government by the Elite" is now recommended—not government by the people for the people. No wonder fair representation by proportional representation is denied to us. When anybody starts talking like that, I am reminded of the old lady who

asked her vicar if one would have to associate with the lower orders in Heaven. The vicar replied: "Madame, so long as you feel like that about it, the matter will not arise."

I am a small employer, a small manufacturer in the export trade. It is a small family business where we work personally among the men. After forty years, I feel one of them. So when these people start patronizing the common man, I feel they are trying to patronize me. I want none of it. An inferiority complex is pitiable, but a superiority complex is disgusting. It is the common man who has made Britain great. It is the business of Liberals to see that he gets opportunity and liberty. Anybody who takes away the spirit of freedom by putting the people in chains does more than damage his country—he damages the whole world community. Britain, in the past, has held up the torch of liberty for all mankind. May she hold it up once again!

Huddersfield, England

The millions of people in this world really do not know how marvelously they are wrought, what fountains of wisdom they contain, nor do they know how wonderful they can make life for themselves. The real reason why this is so is because we have all departed from the directions of our nature.

FRANCIS NEILSON

Francis Neilson, An Appreciation

By JOHN HERVEY

I

IT WAS SOMETHING over a hundred years ago that two young men, Parisians out upon a sight-seeing tour, stood one morning before the cathedral of Amiens. The sun had just risen over Picardy and the horizontal rays touched its towers with fire, while its vast portal was still veiled by the misty shadows of the dawn. Seen thus, "the Parthenon of Gothic architecture" assumed an aspect of such sublimity that one of them, after a period of silent contemplation, said to his companion:

"Why is it, Henri, that we do not erect such edifices in our day?"

To which the other responded:

"My dear Alphonse, the men of that day had convictions while we moderns have only opinions; and something more than opinions are required to build a cathedral."

The incident was made memorable by the fact that Heinrich Heine was its protagonist. Heine stands historically among the foremost of those whom he characterized as "we moderns." He was, in his own words, a "child of the Revolution" and as such spoke, most emphatically, by the book. His genius in the wielding of words has immortalized him—but never, throughout the range of his many books, did he express so much, in language so condensed, as in this spontaneous *aperçu*. That there are sermons in the stones of Amiens other men have assured us—Ruskin has declared them to constitute a bible. Similarly, in the epigram of Heine which they inspired, there is indeed a weighty text. One whose import today remains as pregnant as upon the moment of its utterance, whose implications expand as time marches on and whose truth imposes itself with ever-increasing force.

We have, however, always to reckon with exceptions. It is often asserted that in such cases they merely exemplify the rule—and perhaps, speaking broadly, that is so. While again, they may also be said to create, and to enforce, rules of their own which cannot be evaded. We may leave this to the dialecticians as beside the mark, adding only that some of them tower over the landscape as commandingly as does the minster of St. Firmin over the city which it glorifies.

"We moderns," weltering as we are in the revolutionary chaos of our time, are for the most part as men bewildered, chartless and adrift, swept

from our havens and bound we know not whither. Nevertheless, at times we encounter a man so exceptional, so truly *au dessus la mêlée*, that, while intensely interested in its progress and the "shape of things to come," he remains master of a spiritual poise and an inner serenity as rarely to be met with as they are difficult to attain. Such a man is Francis Neilson; and if we are moved to wonder at the tranquil beauty of his thought, the elevation with which it so infallibly is expressed, to admiration at the firmness of its foundations, the surety of its thrusts and buttresses, and to appreciation of the moral and ethical firmness by which it is steadied and directed, we cannot feel surprise to learn one of their sources. That source—it has been one of the great controlling influences upon his personality—has been his love for and study of Gothic architecture as embodied in the mighty structures which are its monuments. His spirit has been interpenetrated by the truth, the beauty and the grandeur which give to those edifices that unity in diversity which has no other counterpart in the creations of mankind.

II

IN THE EFFORT to describe the versatility of human genius such epithets as many-sided, myriad-minded, wide-ranging, and the like, have been coined. Francis Neilson falls within this classification. Not only has he touched life at many points, but he has come to grips with it, in an almost bewildering variety of ways. The catalogue of his activities is one difficult to match, especially in this epoch of specialization and of concentrated effort set in one narrow groove. At the same time he has never attempted to be all things to all men. His endeavor has been rather to comprehend humanity by the observation and study of what it does and how, with a sweep approaching the cosmic. That he was born in England but for many years has been an American citizen, together with a lengthy list of other biographical facts, may be found set forth in the handbooks. To these merely literal items may be appended the much more significant if transcendental one that in reality he is a citizen of the world. There is little of it worth seeing and knowing with which he is not familiar, his contacts never superficial and invariably sympathetic. Searching for a synthesis he has preferred always to consider it as a whole—but never from the doctrinaire viewpoint of the professional one-worlder or the world-political visionary or propagandist. Ulterior motives have never determined his attitude nor moulded his opinions. Realities he has at no time blinked or minimized, but he has never become their victim. Here, as always, his innate spirituality has not failed him. What shall it profit a man to gain

the whole world if he lose his own soul?—the admonition has rung through his crowded and his silent hours with a reverberance to which his answer has not been the equivocation with which the most of us would make shift to elude it.

Having sat among the law-makers, he has assisted at the adjustment of the most complicated relations of men and of nations, so often and so unexpectedly tragic in their dénouements. Having trod the boards upon which they are depicted as sheer comedy, he has been enabled to measure the sublime by the ridiculous and comprehend how inseparably they are allied. As educator he has run the gamut from the simple rôle of the elementary teacher to that of collaboration upon the curricula and the policies of great universities. He has been intimately connected with the administration of great industrial enterprises—and he has devoted himself assiduously to the every-day problems of private ownership and the purely personal responsibilities of the country squire. Of art, in all its forms, he has been a life-long and enraptured devotee; of literature an adept and prolific practitioner; of music a lover and promoter in its highest reaches; of sport an alumnus, in whom the fine points of a Derby winner awaken the same thrill of appreciation with which he surveys a dry-point by Duerer or an engraving by Nanteuil, the profile upon a Renaissance medal or the sumptuous elegance and subtle craftsmanship of a binding by Sangorski.

And yet—with all this he has chosen to devote his life to what has been called the dismal science. Having the entrée to almost any sphere which he might care to penetrate, with an equipment, a background and a personality enabling him to take a high and an assured place wherever he went, he has turned aside from the fascinations and the enchantments that so eagerly solicited him (and whose appeal, to a nature so richly sensitive, was so difficult to resist), to consecrate himself to the cause of social betterment and human amelioration, asking no reward except that his efforts be not altogether vain; their results, if not all that he hoped for, not wholly fruitless; and well knowing that to expect more was to demand the impossible.

III

THE READERS OF THIS JOURNAL, and of the numerous books bearing his name, have become familiar with the ideas and beliefs, the thoughts and feelings of Francis Neilson and have recognized in him one of those men whose disappearance Heine mourned—those men with convictions, phenomena now so rarely met with. The grace with which he expresses them has about it something now classic, now familiar. He gives us passages

worthy of the great masters of style in the transparent yet vigorous turn of their phraseology, their chiseled diction, their elevation of thought and warmth of conception. Again he addresses the reader in the plainest and simplest manner with words as direct and forceful as they are strongly felt and energetically projected. For, it must be remembered, conviction—absolute convictions which a man has conceived in the depths of his nature and brought to birth in the passion of their procreation—cannot be expressed otherwise, cannot be presented in their habit as they live and as they are lived.

Mr. Neilson, however, when most impassioned, never loses his grasp upon the verities or conjures up for us transcendental dreams arrayed in rainbow robes. He has the saving discretion of balance, of measure, and of self-control. Of the overdone and the pumped-up, the declamatory and the inflated styles common to most writers upon weighty subjects, he is never guilty. When most earnest he remains poised, reasonable and master of both his materials and the use of them. He seldom raises his voice—but how far it carries and how persuasive are its accents! It is impossible for him to touch upon anything that he does not dignify, yet the simplicity with which he accomplishes this is invariable. If we ask why, the answer may be found in the words of the old author who wrote: "How near is grandeur to this earth." While moving, as he so often does, through the high altitudes, Francis Neilson's premises and postulates remain based always upon the humanities. He always comes back to them, they are in fact the thorough bass upon which the counterpoint of his conceptions ultimately are worked out with the precision, harmonious but inevitable, of a fugue by Bach.

Since Heine uttered his apophthegm to Alphonse Karr a furious spate of revolutionary waters has swept, again and again, beneath the bridge of history, leaving at the last little of the once familiar landscape unsubmerged, few of the old landmarks visible and these undermined and tottering. Everywhere are beheld the wreckage and débris of a world in flux and striving frenziedly to overleap those flaming barriers which, nevertheless, continue and always will to circumscribe its orbit. Convictions have not only been supplanted by opinions—everything in any way akin has undergone a similar transformation. Expediency has been substituted for ethics, mechanism for morality, equivocation for equity, ribaldry for decency, nihilism for belief, words for things, ideologies for ideals, and the gospel of brute force for that of even human justice. The mouths of men are full of the most exalted sentiments, to which their actions continuously give

the lie. Poetry has been put to the sword; and art, looking on, has applauded and lent its assistance. . . . The only moral? . . . "They have made a desert and call it peace."

None of "we moderns" has observed these things more attentively than Francis Neilson nor, as an individual, combated them more uncompromisingly. From his inner resources, so inexhaustible, he has continued to "arm himself against a sea of troubles" and sustain the struggle for the Good Life for all men of good will. If at times he may seem at the point of despair as he peers over the verge into the abyss below, it is momentary only. The vertigo which causes others to fling themselves headlong into the raging chaos does not infect him. A man of convictions, if, as perpetually we are being warned, civilization is upon the point of committing suicide, he will bear no part in the débâcle; it is because in the hour of need those convictions have been his salvation.

IV

LET US, IN CONCLUDING this very inadequate appreciation of a man whom we all delight to honor, return to the scene where it was begun. It is the common idea that centuries were always required for the construction of a great Gothic cathedral, and that even after they had passed, it remained unfinished; that so to speak, it was an immense organism built up, "little cell by cell," through the lapse of prolonged historic cycles—otherwise it could never have existed. This, nevertheless, is a delusion. Some of the largest and most elaborate of these prodigious structures were reared in less than one hundred years, some in less than fifty. Amiens, as originally planned, was complete within sixty-odd years after the cornerstone was laid; while Salisbury, most magnificent of all English Gothic minsters and contemporary with it in point of time (the thirteenth century), required only forty-six, having been begun subsequently to Amiens but completed before it. When centuries elapsed between the foundation and the finishing of such a structure, it was not because its production required them but the result of constantly recurring wars and sieges, of rapine, vandalism and iconoclasm, natural cataclysms and, most especially, destructive fires all-too-frequent in their incidence. A single lifetime was, therefore, all that sufficed, in time of peace, for the beholder to witness the consummation of the architect's conception "from turret to foundation stone."

For eighty years now Francis Neilson has been rearing the structure of his life. Though it stands within a close apparently secluded, within a stone's throw is the marketplace. Stretches of velvet sward surround it, barred with beds of glowing flowers; the massed foliage of stately trees is

reflected in unruffled waters. Broad graveled walks wind through it and lead up to the portal, above which towers the façade, ever up and up. The central door stands open, around and above it clustering the forms of saints and martyrs, kings and heroes, virgins and ministers of grace, supporting and encircling a divine figure from which all radiates. The entire façade is mantled with masses of sculptured ornament of which every least leaf and tendril, fold of drapery, cornice and volute is expressive of some subtle symbolism, some facet of the builder's faith. As we enter, the light filtered through the great rose window falls softly upon the tessellated pavement of the nave, stretching away beneath a forest of columns and arches toward the transepts and the apse, where rises the high altar, looking down upon the choir. There are many chapels, nooks for meditation and places for prayer. From the central pulpit the discourse of the preacher rises in tones sonorous, searching and poignant. Its theme, though always richly diverse, and set forth with a masterful persuasion, is yet always the same—the casting-out of hatred from our souls and its replacement by love and by the love of love. His accents reverberate beneath the arches and as we hearken our cold hearts melt within us and the tears run down our cheeks; for, rising like a flame that folds itself about us, we understand at last his closing adjuration: *"Set not your heart upon the world, neither the things of the world. The world passeth away. But love endureth forever!"*

Chicago

A Bibliography of Francis Neilson 1893-1946

By PHYLLIS EVANS

IN PREPARING THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY of Francis Neilson, with whom I have been associated for nearly thirteen years, I consulted his unpublished "Reminiscences," the card catalogue at the New York Public Library (and personally examined all the works listed therein), and the late Helen Swift Neilson's collection of the author's books. In ascertaining facts about places in which his plays and operettas were produced, I went to newspapers of the time as well as to a scrapbook of clippings in Mr. Neilson's possession. The only record of his works before 1915 (with the exception of the few books listed at the New York Public Library) is set down in his "Reminiscences," and this undoubtedly is incomplete.

After Mr. Neilson left the Royal Opera at the close of the season in 1903, until he was elected to the House of Commons in January, 1910, there is a gap in his writings which has been rather difficult to fill. During this period, according to his own account, he was making a thorough study of fundamental economic issues. He had joined the Liberal party in 1902 and had been accepted as a candidate, although he did not contest a division until the General Election of 1906. From late 1903 until January, 1910, Mr. Neilson's chief activities were concerned with delivering lectures to literary and debating societies, writing letters to provincial papers (such as the *Wolverhampton Star* and the leading Durham newspaper, published in Bishop Auckland), answering the claims of Socialists, reading manuscripts, and producing plays. In these various pursuits he was able to earn an adequate living and to enjoy modest comforts with his family at Hodnet. But the numerous pieces he was writing weekly at that time for provincial newspapers could not be traced. Therefore, the bibliography for the early years is not necessarily complete and should not be considered so.

As for the articles that appeared in *The Freeman* and in *Unity*, I have taken only the pieces that were signed by him, those written under his pen name of "Richard Cloughton," and those later identified as Mr. Neilson's. Many untitled paragraphs in the Miscellany as well as many editorials in *The Freeman* were written by him but are not listed.

This bibliography does not include a series of thirty unpublished lectures delivered by Mr. Neilson at the University of Chicago about 1932, entitled "Religion, Science and the Arts." These are preserved only in the form of notes. Nor does it include several lectures delivered in England be-

tween 1903 and 1910 on "Ibsen," "Browning," "Tolstoy," "Socrates," etc.

The bibliography has been listed chronologically rather than by classification of work, with the idea that it is the most practical arrangement for the student who might wish to trace the development of Mr. Neilson's ideas over the fifty-four year period covered.

1893

La Vivandière (comic opera). Libretto by Francis Neilson, music by Victor Herbert. (Unpublished; never produced).

1894

Prince Ananias (comic opera in two acts). Libretto by Francis Neilson, music by Victor Herbert. New York: Edward Schuberth & Co.; London: E. Ascherberg & Co.; Leipzig: C. Dieckmann, 1894. 72 pp. (Produced in New York, Broadway Theatre, Nov. 20, 1894; Pittsburgh, Alvin Theater, Jan. 14, 1895; Cleveland, Opera House, Jan. 21, 1895; Buffalo, Star Theater, Jan. 28, 1895; Brooklyn, New Park Theatre, Feb. 11, 1895; Boston, Tremont Theatre, Feb. 25, 1895; Chicago, Grand Opera House, Mar. 18, 1895; Indianapolis, April 15, 1895; Detroit, May 6, 1895; Philadelphia, Broad Street Theatre, May 20, 1895; Kansas City, Sept. 25, 1895; St. Joseph, Missouri, Tootle Theatre, Sept. 26, 1895; Des Moines, Foster's Opera House, Sept. 27, 1895; San Francisco, Columbia Theatre, Oct. 21, 1895).

1899

Manabozo (a libretto). London: John Macqueen, 1899. 90 pp. (First part of an uncompleted trilogy on the myths of the North American Indians, composed for Anton Seidl).

1900

Madame Bohemia (novel, illustrated by Charlotte Harding). London: John Macqueen, 1900. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1901. 410 pp. (Dramatized by the author and produced by him at the Duke of York's Theatre, London).

1902

The Bath Road (a romantic comedy in three acts). London: John Macqueen, 1902. 177 pp. (Produced at The University Theatre, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, April 19, 1923. Directed by Prof. E. C. Mabie).

1903

The Folly of The Wise (novel, also known as **Helen Sefton**). London: John Macqueen, 1903. (Publishing house failed while this novel was being printed).

1906

The Democratic Monthly (magazine). Shrewsbury (England): Livesey & Co. Ltd., St. John's Hill Press, December, 1906-April, 1908. (Founded, owned, edited, and written by Francis Neilson; a journal standing for freedom of the individual and advocating the taxation of land values).

1908

The Crucifixion of Philip Strong (a dramatization of the novels of Charles Sheldon). (Produced at Whitfield's Tabernacle, London, 1908; motion picture rights sold to Edison Co., U. S., 1916; unpublished).

1909

The Taxation of Land Values versus Tariff Reform (a debate). Shrewsbury: Livesey Ltd., no date. 30 pp. (Mr. Francis Neilson—For the Taxation of Land Values; Mr. L. S. Amery—For Tariff Reform; debated at Wolverhampton, April 22, 1909; Chairman: The Right Hon. the Earl of Dartmouth).

Blatchfordism (pamphlet). Shrewsbury: Livesey Ltd., no date. 8 pp. (A reply to Blatchford, *Britain for the British*, p. 61. Reprinted from *The Democratic Monthly*, No. 4 (March, 1907), pp. 42-4).

The Sloughs of Socialism (pamphlet). Shrewsbury: Livesey Ltd., no date. ("The Phrases of a Popular Orator Analysed." Reprinted from *The Democratic Monthly*, No. 7 (June, 1907), pp. 75-6; No. 8 (July, 1907), pp. 88-9).

1911

The Crucible (play in three acts). (Produced in London, Comedy Theatre, with Henry Ainley; unpublished).

A Butterfly on the Wheel (play in four acts). By Francis Neilson and Edward G. Hemmerde. New York and London: Samuel French, 1922. 80 pp. (Produced at the Globe Theatre, London, by Mr. Lewis Waller, April 18, 1911; revived at the Queen's Theatre, London, by Mr. Lewis Waller, Nov. 11, 1911; produced at 39th Street Theatre, New York, Jan. 8, 1912, by Mr. Lewis Waller and Messrs. Shubert Brothers).

1913

Ralph Voyce (novel). (Unpublished; "In memory of Alfred, mathematician, scholar, and tramp").

1915

How Diplomats Make War. By a British Statesman. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1915. 376 pp. Introd. by Albert Jay Nock. 2nd ed., May, 1916; 3rd ed., Jan., 1918; 4th ed., Nov., 1921, Introd. by Albert Jay Nock; 5th ed., Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., Oct., 1940, Introd. by John Haynes Holmes. "The Last Chapter" (pamphlet) reprinted, Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1939, with a Preface by Dr. John Haynes Holmes; 12 pp. *Translations*: German, *Wie Diplomaten Kriege Machen*, by M. Gr. v. Hardenberg. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1919. Swedish, *Huru diplomater framkalla krig*, by E. Brusewitz. Stockholm: Svenska Andelsförlaget, 1919. French, *Comment les diplomates font les guerres*, by H. Jacoby. Paris: F. Rieder et Cie., 1923. Preface by G. Demartial. Italian, published serially in *Rassegna Internazionale*. (The first American edition was published anonymously because the author was still a member of Parliament).

1916

A Strong Man's House (novel). Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916. 360 pp. 2nd printing, New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924.

1917

Barriers (play). (Unpublished).

The Soul of Love (verse). *Unity*, LXXIX, No. 7 (Apr. 12, 1917), 97.

1918

Safeguards. *Unity* LXXX, No. 26 (Feb. 28, 1928,) 407-09; LXXXI, No. 1 (Mar. 7, 1918), 7.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones. *Unity*, LXXXII, No. 5 (Oct. 10, 1918), 54.

1919

The Old Freedom. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1919. 176 pp. (A study on the restoration of natural rights and the regaining of economic freedom).

Unity (magazine; weekly, except bi-weekly from July 15, 1920, to Sept. 29, 1921). Chicago: Unity Publishing Company, Abraham Lincoln Centre. Edited by John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson from Vol. LXXXIII, No. 1 (March, 1919) to Vol. XCVI, No. 23 (Feb., 1926).

News From Europe. *Unity*, LXXXII, No. 24 (Feb. 20, 1919), 317; LXXXIII, No. 2 (Mar. 13, 1919), 17; LXXXIII, No. 3 (Mar. 20, 1919), 27; LXXXIII, No. 4 (Mar. 27, 1919), 44; LXXXIII, No. 6 (Apr. 10, 1919), 68; LXXXIII, No. 7 (Apr. 17, 1919), 80; LXXXIII, No. 8 (Apr. 24, 1919), 94; LXXXIII, No. 9 (May 1, 1919), 104; LXXXIII, No. 10 (May 8, 1919), 116; LXXXIII, No. 11 (May 15, 1919), 130; LXXXIII, No. 12 (May 22, 1919), 142; LXXXIII, No. 14 (June 5, 1919), 166; LXXXIII, No. 16 (June 19, 1919), 189; LXXXIII, No. 17 (June 26, 1919), 201; LXXXIII, No. 19 (July 10, 1919), 225; LXXXIII, No. 21 (July 24, 1919), 248; LXXXIII, No. 22 (July 31, 1919), 262; LXXXIII, No. 25 (Aug. 21, 1919), 298; LXXXIII, No. 26 (Aug. 28, 1919), 309; LXXXIV, No. 1 (Sept. 4, 1919), 13; LXXXIV, No. 3 (Sept. 18, 1919), 44.

The Blockade. *Unity*, LXXXII, No. 25 (Feb. 27, 1919), 330.

The Very Central Doctrine. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 1 (Mar. 6, 1919), 5.

The Secret Treaties and Allied Discussion. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 4 (Mar. 27, 1919), 40.

Democracy and the Press. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 6 (Apr. 10, 1919), 64.

Our Foreign-Born Residents. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 8 (Apr. 24, 1919), 90.

American Ships and Foreign Trade. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 10 (May 8, 1919), 113.

"The Labor That I Had Labored to Do." *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 12 (May 22, 1919), 137.

A Reason for Bolshevism. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 13 (May 29, 1919), 153.

Tariffs and Armaments. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 14 (June 5, 1919), 161.

Allied Preparations for the War. By Richard Claughton. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 15 (June 12, 1919), 174. (Richard Claughton was a pen name used by Francis Neilson for various contributions to *The Freeman and Unity*).

The Actor's Hamlet. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 16 (June 19, 1919), 185.

The Peace Terms. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 20 (July 17, 1919), 233.

What Is a Universality? *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 22 (July 31, 1919), 257.

The Beginning and the End. By Richard Claughton. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 23 (Aug. 7, 1919), 272.

Returning Aliens and Cheap Land. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 24 (Aug. 14, 1919), 282.

- The Opinion of Others. *Unity*, LXXXIII, No. 26 (Aug. 28, 1919), 305.
 Literature and Russia. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 1 (Sept. 4, 1919), 9.
 The Fool's Paradise. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 2 (Sept. 11, 1919), 21.
 "The Level of the Brute." *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 4 (Sept. 25, 1919), 53.
 Isvolsky's War. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 6 (Oct. 9, 1919), 87.
 Lloyd George and His Coalition. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 8 (Oct. 23, 1919), 117.
 God or Mammon. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 10 (Nov. 6, 1919), 149.
 Russia and the Interventionists. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 11 (Nov. 13, 1919), 170.
 The Parting of the Ways. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 12 (Nov. 20, 1919), 181.
 "How the War Came." *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 14 (Dec. 4, 1919), 213.
 Ants and Men. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 16 (Dec. 18, 1919), 245.
 Jesus of Nazareth (verse). *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 17 (Dec. 25, 1919), 257.

1920

- New Year's Morning. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 18 (Jan. 1, 1920), 278.
 Europe's New Year's Gift. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 19 (Jan. 8, 1920), 295.
 What Is a Radical? *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 20 (Jan. 15, 1920), 309.
 Nonconformity and Deportation. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 22 (Jan. 29, 1920), 341.
 The Revival of Toryism. *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 24, (Feb. 12, 1920), 373.
 Man or the State? *Unity*, LXXXIV, No. 26 (Feb. 26, 1920), 405.
 Universal Military Training. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 2 (Mar. 11, 1920), 21.
 Sir Oliver Lodge—An Appreciation. By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 2 (Mar. 11, 1920), 27.
 A Unified Europe? *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 4 (Mar. 25, 1920), 54.
 Patriotism and Responsibility for the War. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 6 (Apr. 8, 1920), 85.
 Saints of the People. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 8 (Apr. 22, 1920), 117.
 Prosperity and Stagnation. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 10 (May 6, 1920), 149.
 Reason and Horror. By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 11 (May 13, 1920), 173.
 Industry and the Strike Evil, Part I. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 12 (May 20, 1920), 181;
 Part II, LXXXV, No. 13 (May 27, 1920), 198.
 Senegalese Troops in Europe. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 15 (June 10, 1920), 229.
 The World That Will Not Come to an End. By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 16 (June 17, 1920), 246.
 European Opinion on Polish-Russian War. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 17 (June 24, 1920), 261.
 The British Government and the Polish Adventure. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 17 (June 24, 1920), 262.
 The Briey Basin Scandal. By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 17 (June 24, 1920), 265.
 The Political and Financial Conference at Spa. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 18 (July 1, 1920), 276.
 "The Ordeal of Mark Twain." By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 20 (July 29, 1920), 315.
 The Principles of Jesus. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 21 (Aug. 12, 1920), 325.
 Imperialism. By Richard Cloughton. *Unity*, LXXXV, No. 22 (Aug. 26, 1920), 343.

- A Victim of the System. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 2 (Sept. 23, 1920), 21.
- Carson: Bigot and Rebel. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 4 (Oct. 14, 1920), 53.
- Preparing Public Opinion. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 8 (Nov. 11, 1920), 117.
- Monastic England. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 10 (Nov. 25, 1920), 149.
- The Appeal of the Barbizon Painters. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 14 (Dec. 23, 1920), 214.
- Blue and Purple (verse). (Songs to a Wife). New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1920. 94 pp.
- A Journal to Rosalind. Anonymous. New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1920. 157 pp.
- The Freeman (weekly magazine). Edited by Francis Neilson and Albert Jay Nock. New York: The Freeman Corporation, 1920-24. 8 vols.
- Introduction. In Max Hirsch, *An Analysis of the Proposals and Conceptions of Socialism*, (Three Addresses) (New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1920. The Freeman Pamphlets), p. 7.
- The Case for Human Nature. *The Freeman*, I, No. 1 (Mar. 17, 1920), 7-8. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., pp. 29-33).
- A Dear Memory. *The Freeman*, I, No. 2 (Mar. 24, 1920), 34. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 177-80).
- [Grandi, the Carpenter.] *The Freeman*, I, No. 2 (Mar. 24, 1920), 44. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, p. 142).
- Richard Parkes Bonington. *The Freeman*, I, No. 3 (Mar. 31, 1920), 66-7. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 180-5).
- [Rodin's "Hand of God."] *The Freeman*, I, No. 3 (Mar. 31, 1920), 68. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, p. 144).
- Paul Manship's Vision. *The Freeman*, I, No. 6 (Apr. 21, 1920), 138. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 185-7).
- Passion (verse). By Richard Claughton. *The Freeman*, I, No. 7 (Apr. 28, 1920), 153.
- A Lesson in Economics (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Claughton. *The Freeman*, II, No. 27 (Sept. 15, 1920), 14-5.
- [The Passing of the Free-Lunch Counter.] *The Freeman*, II, No. 27 (Sept. 15, 1920), 17. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 147-9).
- Illusions of the Landless. *The Freeman*, II, No. 28 (Sept. 22, 1920), 29-30. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 45-9).
- [Louis Saar.] *The Freeman*, II, No. 28 (Sept. 22, 1920), 39-40. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 149-52).
- [Some Stories About Wagner.] *The Freeman*, II, No. 32 (Oct. 20, 1920), 136-7. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 152-3).
- [New York in the Eighties.] *The Freeman*, II, No. 34 (Nov. 3, 1920), 182. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 156-9).
- Land Valuation (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Claughton. *The Freeman*, II, No. 34 (Nov. 3, 1920), 184-5.

1921

- The Spectres of Reflection. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 16 (Jan. 6, 1921), 245.
- Ireland, Past and Present. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 18 (Jan. 20, 1921), 277.
- The Myth and the Minister. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 20 (Feb. 3, 1921), 309.

- Indemnities. *Unity*, LXXXVI, No. 22 (Feb. 17, 1921), 341.
- French Finance and Europe's Future. *Unity*, LXXXVII, No. 1 (Mar. 3, 1921), 5.
- A Naval Holiday. *Unity*, LXXXVII, No. 2 (Mar. 10, 1921), 26.
- Religion and Art in the 13th Century. *Unity*, LXXXVII, No. 5 (Mar. 31, 1921), 69.
- Duty to Civilization, Part I. *Unity*, LXXXVII, No. 7 (Apr. 14, 1921), 101; Part II, LXXXVII, No. 9 (Apr. 28, 1921), 133; Part III, LXXXVII, No. 11 (May 12, 1921), 165; Part IV, LXXXVII, No. 13 (May 26, 1921), 197; Part V, LXXXVII, No. 15 (June 9, 1921), 229; Part VI, LXXXVII, No. 17 (June 23, 1921), 262; Part VII, LXXXVII, No. 19 (July 7, 1921), 293; Part VIII, LXXXVII, No. 21 (Aug. 4, 1921), 325; Part IX (Conclusion), LXXXVIII, No. 1 (Sept. 1, 1921), 5. (Also published as a book, *q.v.*).
- The Treaty of Bankruptcy. *Unity*, LXXXVIII, No. 8 (Nov. 3, 1921), 119.
- A Matter of Importance. *Unity*, LXXXVIII, No. 16 (Dec. 29, 1921), 245.
- Duty to Civilization. New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1923. 136 pp. (Reprinted from *Unity* (weekly), Chicago, April-August, 1921). 2nd ed., The Freeman Pamphlets, no date; 3rd ed., Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1940. 104 pp. *Translation*: German, *Eine Pflicht gegen die Kultur*, by Willy E. Peters. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1922. 110 pp.
- The Bases of the Five Essentials. *The Freeman*, II, No. 50 (Feb. 23, 1921), 558. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 49-52).
- Direct Action (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, III, No. 61 (May 11, 1921), 209-10.
- An English Pilgrimage. By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, IV, No. 92 (Dec. 14, 1921), 320.

1922

- A Lost Tradition (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, IV, No. 97 (Jan. 18, 1922), 448.
- While Conquerors Think. *Foreign Affairs* (London), (published by the Union of Democratic Control), III, No. 8 (Feb., 1922), 119-20. Also published in *Unity*, LXXXIX, No. 1 (Mar. 2, 1922), 13.
- The "Sanctity" of Treaties. *The Freeman*, V, No. 106 (Mar. 22, 1922), 30-1. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 75-8).
- "The Love of Three Oranges." By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, V, No. 106 (Mar. 22, 1922), 39-40.
- The New Leisured Class. *The Freeman*, V, No. 108 (Apr. 5, 1922), 76-7. (Reprinted in *The Freeman Book*, pp. 79-82). (Reprinted in *The Monthly Freeman* (N. Y.: Henry George School of Social Science), II, No. 4 (Feb., 1939), 18-9).
- Ireland's Opportunity. *Unity*, LXXXVIII, No. 20 (Jan. 26, 1922), 310.
- Art, and the Turmoil of Existence. *Unity*, LXXXIX, No. 2 (Mar. 9, 1922), 21.
- Without Sun and Air. *Unity*, LXXXIX, No. 15 (June 8, 1922), 230.

1923

- An Unreliable Authority (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, VI, No. 147 (Jan. 3, 1923), 402.
- A Challenge Unanswered (Letter to the Editors). By Richard Cloughton. *The Freeman*, VII, No. 162 (Apr. 18, 1923), 137-8.

Ibsen and Economic Justice. By Richard Claughton. *The Freeman*, VII, No. 165 (May 9, 1923), 204-6.

Duty to Civilization, Part X. *Unity*, XC, No. 19 (Jan. 25, 1923), 293; Part XI, XC, No. 21 (Feb. 8, 1923), 327.

1924

The Sin Eater's Hallowe'en (a fantasy in one act and two scenes). New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924. 89 pp. (A dramatic satire on international politics).

A Mixed Foursome (a comedy in three acts). New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924. 106 pp.

The Desire for Change (a comedy in three acts). New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924. 124 pp. (Produced in London, Playhouse Theatre, 1925).

The Impossible Philanthropist (a comedy in four acts). New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924. 115 pp. (Produced in Paris, Théâtre Albert I^{er}, 1925).

The Freeman Book. Compiled by B. W. Huebsch. New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1924. 394 pp. ("Typical editorials, essays, critiques, and other selections from the eight volumes of the *Freeman*, 1920-24," with the following from Francis Neilson: The Case for Human Nature—Illusions of the Landless—The Bases of the Five Essentials—The "Sanctity" of Treaties—The New Leisured Class—[Grandi, the Carpenter]—[Rodin's "Hand of God"]—[The Passing of the Free-Lunch Counter]—[Louis Saar]—[Some Stories about Wagner]—[New York in the Eighties]—A Dear Memory—Richard Parkes Bonington—Paul Manship's Vision).

1925

The Day Before Commencement (a comedy in four acts). New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1925. 155 pp. (Never produced).

1927

The Queen of Nectaria (a fantasy in four acts). New York: The Viking Press, 1927. 123 pp. (Never produced).

Jesus of Nazareth. *Unity*, C, No. 15 (Dec. 19, 1927), 237.

1929

Le Baiser de Sang (drame en deux actes). Translated by Jean Aragny. Paris: Librairie Theatrale, 1929. 62 pp. (Produced in Paris, Grand-Guignol, March 6, 1929; revived at the Grand-Guignol, Nov. 8, 1937).

1933

Control From the Top. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1933. 190 pp.

The Eleventh Commandment. New York: The Viking Press, 1933. 283 pp. 2nd ed., Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1944.

1934

Sociocratic Escapades. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1934. 319 pp.

The Professor's Hotchpotch. By Adam Savage. New York: Schoen Printing Company, 1934. 122 pp. (A reply to Prof. Albert Galloway Keller, *Man's Rough Road*).

1936

The House in the Big Yard (mystery novel). (Unpublished).

1938

Man at the Crossroads. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1938. 272 pp.

The March of Christendom (a dramatic pageant). Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., no date. 78 pp. (Written upon the request of Dean F. W. Dwelly of Liverpool Cathedral, for presentation at Liverpool Episcopal Cathedral, England, upon the occasion of the proposed opening of the central space in June, 1940; the event was indefinitely postponed due to the outbreak of World War II).

A Professor's Balderdash, A Critique of *The Folklore of Capitalism*, by Prof. Thurman W. Arnold. By Adam Savage (another pen name). Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1938. 39 pp.

[Reminiscences.] The Last of the English Radicals. (Unpublished).

1939

The Last Chapter (pamphlet). With a Preface by Dr. John Haynes Holmes. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1939. 12 pp. (Reprinted from *How Diplomats Make War*, New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1915).

The Present Significance of the Past. Ripon, Wis.: The Inversetti Press, 1939. 21 pp. (Commencement address at Ripon College, June 12, 1939. Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1946).

Preface. In Max Hirsch, *Socialism the Slave State*, edited by Will Lissner, (New York: Henry George School of Social Science, 1939), p. 2.

The Long Hand (play in three acts). (Unpublished).

Hats, Ltd. (comedy in three acts). (Unpublished).

The New Leisured Class. *The Monthly Freeman* (New York: Henry George School of Social Science), II, No. 4 (Feb., 1939), 18-9. (Reprinted from *The Freeman*. V, No. 108 (Apr. 5, 1922), 76-7; and *The Freeman Book*, pp. 79-82).

[A Letter to the Editor.] *The Monthly Freeman*, II, No. 11 (Sept., 1939), 15. (A reply to Mr. Nock's theory of the "educable élite." Mr. Nock's rejoinder appears in *The Monthly Freeman*, III, No. 2 (Dec., 1939), 35).

1940

Henry George, the Scholar. New York: Henry George School of Social Science, 1940. 23 pp. (Commencement address at Henry George School of Social Science, New York, June 3, 1940). (Reprinted Chicago: Henry George School, etc., April, 1942. 19 pp.).

The Bible, as History, Literature, and Philosophy. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1940. 29 pp. (Three lectures delivered at Ripon College, Spring, 1940. Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

Dangerous Thoughts Without Dynamite. *The Monthly Freeman*, III, No. 8 (June, 1940), 179-81.

The Great Parliamentary Conspiracy. *The Monthly Freeman*, IV, No. 1 (Nov., 1940), 9-11. (Reprinted from *The Old Freedom*, 1919).

The Okies of Ancient England. *The Monthly Freeman*, IV, No. 2, (Dec., 1940), 39-40. (Reprinted from *The Old Freedom*, 1919).

The Tragedy of Europe, A Day by Day Commentary on the Second World War. Vol. I, Sept., 1939–Oct., 1940. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1940. 710 pp. Introd. by Robert M. Hutchins. 2nd ed., 1941; 3rd ed., 1941.

1941

Man, Builder and Wrecker. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1940. 22 pp. (Lecture delivered before the Chicago Society, Archaeological Institute of America, Nov. 13, 1941. Reprinted in *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, I, No. 3 (Apr., 1942), 223–38; and in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

Israel in Bondage. *The Monthly Freeman*, IV, No. 3 (Jan., 1941), 61–2.

The War Guilt. *The Monthly Freeman*, IV, No. 5 (Mar., 1941). (Reprinted from *The Tragedy of Europe*, Vol. I).

Production: A Modern Prometheus. *The Monthly Freeman*, IV, No. 6 (Apr., 1941), 131–2. (Reprinted from *The Old Freedom*, 1919).

Internationalism and Europeanism. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, I, No. 1 (Oct., 1941), 79–82. (Reprinted from *The Tragedy of Europe*, Vol. I).

1942

The Garden of Doctor Persuasion (novel). Chicago: Low's Letter Service (mimeographed ed.), March 20, 1942; Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1942; 2nd ed., 1943. (An allegorical novel dealing with a practical mystic).

The Tragedy of Europe, A Day by Day Commentary on the Second World War. Vol. II, Nov., 1940–Dec., 1941. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1942. 670 pp. Introd. by A. J. Carlson.

Man, Builder and Wrecker. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, I, No. 3 (Apr., 1942), 223–38. (Reprinted from pamphlet of same name, 1941), (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

Peter Abélard, 1079–1142. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, I, No. 4 (July, 1942), 449–54. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

Émile Mâle and the Spirit of Medieval Culture. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 1 (Oct., 1942), 15–34. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

New Lights for Old Stars. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 1 (Oct., 1942), 125–29.

1943

The Tragedy of Europe, A Day by Day Commentary on the Second World War. Vol. III, Dec., 1941–May, 1943. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1943. 704 pp. Introd. by Will Lissner.

The Passing of the Middle Ages. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 2 (Jan., 1943), 175–92. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

William Byrd (1542–3–1623), "Father of Musicke." *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 2 (Jan., 1943), 274–77. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

The Roots of the Tree of Learning. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 3 (Apr. 1943), 305–23. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

Culture and Synthesis in the Social Sciences. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 3 (Apr., 1943), 387–9.

The Return to Mysticism. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 4 (July, 1943), 503–16. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

The Living Spirit and the Economic Man. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, II, No. 4 (July, 1943), 542.

Prospects for a Revival of Political Radicalism. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, III, No. 1 (Oct., 1943), 15-27. (Reprinted in pamphlet form, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1943).

1944

The Tragedy of Europe, A Day by Day Commentary on the Second World War. Vol. IV, June, 1943-Aug., 1944. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1944. 751 pp. Introd. by Charles C. Tansill.

Hate, the Enemy of Peace, A Reply to Lord Vansittart. Chicago: Allied Printing Company, 1944. 59 pp.

In Quest of Justice. New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1944. 135 pp. (Six lectures delivered to the Henry George School of Social Science, Chicago, 1943-44).

The Natural Law of Justice. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, III, No. 2 (Jan., 1944), 167-78. (Reprinted, in part, in *In Quest of Justice*, *supra*).

The Conspiracy Against the English Peasantry. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, III, No. 3 (Apr., 1944), 293-306.

The Conspiracy Against the English Peasantry, II. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, III, No. 4 (July, 1944), 525-38. (This article and the above one were reprinted in pamphlet form, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1944).

A Practical Program for a Just Peace. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, III, No. 4 (July, 1944), 573-82. (Preprinted in pamphlet form, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1944. 10 pp.; later reprinted in a series of editions).

Glastonbury in Legend and History. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, IV, No. 1 (Oct., 1944), 9-23. (Reprinted in *The Roots of Our Learning*, 1946).

1945

The Devil and All (a satire). By Rhadamanthus. Chicago: P. L. Dexter, March, 1945. 135 pp. 2nd ed., 1945.

Science and the Liberal Arts in Education. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, IV, No. 2 (Jan., 1945), 155-74.

The Decay of Liberalism. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, IV, No. 3 (Apr., 1945), 281-310.

The Decline of Civilizations. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, IV, No. 4 (July, 1945), 479-97.

Training Quadrupeds and Educating Bipedes. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, V, No. 1 (Oct., 1945), 27-40.

1946

The Tragedy of Europe, A Day by Day Commentary on the Second World War. Vol. V, Sept., 1944-Aug., 1945. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Pub. Co., 1946. 624 pp.

The Roots of Our Learning. Eleven Essays. New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1946. 320 pp.

Some Thoughts on Education. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, V, No. 2 (Jan., 1946), 261-9.

The Failure of Industrial Strikes. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, V, No. 3 (Apr., 1946), 285-95.

The Ebb and Flow of Democratic Debate. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, V, No. 4 (July, 1946), 497-507.

The Story of *The Freeman*. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, VI, No. 1 (Oct., 1946), Supplement. 53 pp.

The Cloister or the Town. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, VI, No. 1 (Oct., 1946), 17-32.

Education and the Modern Man. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, VI, No. 1 (Oct., 1946), 121-9.

The Tercentenary of Isaac Newton. *Am. Jour. Econ. Socio.*, VI, No. 1 (Oct., 1946), 32.

New York

Contributors

B. W. HUEBSCH, vice president of the Viking Press, Inc., and veteran New York book publisher, was publisher of the old *Freeman*.

WILL LISSNER, member of the news staff of a New York newspaper, writer and editor, is executive editor of *THE JOURNAL*.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, S.T.B. (Harvard, '04), D.D. (J.I.R., '30; St. Lawrence, '31; Meadville, '45), pastor, Community Church of New York. Vice president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; director, American Civil Liberties Union; president, All World Gandhi Fellowship. Gottheil medallist, 1933. Formerly: chairman, General Unitarian Conference; president, Free Religious Association; chairman, City Affairs Committee of New York; editor, *Unity*, Chicago, etc. Author: "The Heart of Scott's Poetry," "Rethinking Religion," etc.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, A.M. (Harvard, '96), Litt.D. (Washington and Lee, '06), LL.D. (Lafayette Coll., '15; Howard, '33), journalist, is the author of "John Brown, A Biography Fifty Years After," "Newspapers and Newspaper Men," "The Disappearing Daily," and many other works. Formerly: editorial writer and president, *New York Evening Post*; editor and publisher, *The Nation*, and owner, *The Nautical Gazette*.

FERDINAND A. HERMENS, Ph.D., associate professor of political science, University of Notre Dame; managing editor, *The Review of Politics*. Author: "Democracy vs. Anarchy, a Study of Proportional Representation," etc.; contributor, *Social Research*, etc.

ALBERT PLEYDELL, M.P.A. (New York), general manager, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. Director, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc. Commissioner of Purchase, City of New York; instructor of business management, Graduate Division for Training in the Public Service, New York University.

GEOFFREY WINSLOW ESTY, M.D., F.A.A.P., is a pediatrician in charge of child guidance for the Division of Maternal and Child Health, New Jersey State Department of Health. He is also a trustee of the Henry George School of Social Science in New York and New Jersey.

JOHN GARSTANG, D.Sc. (Oxon), Hon. LL.D. (Aberdeen), F.S.A., John Rankin Professor of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, since 1907; director, Neilson Expedition to the Near East, 1946. Formerly: director, British School of Archaeology, Jerusalem, 1919-26; director, Department of Antiquities, Government of Palestine, 1920-26. Engaged in archaeological research since 1897; conducted excavations in Britain, Egypt, Nubia, Asia Minor and North Africa, the Sudan and in Palestine; directed Neilson expedition to Cilicia, 1936-39. Author: "The Third Egyptian Dynasty," "The Hittite Empire," "The Foundations of Bible History: Joshua, Judges," etc.

SIDNEY SMITH, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Keeper, Dept. of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum; Professor of Near Eastern Archaeology, University of London. Formerly: Excavations at Ur, 1922-23; director of antiquities, Iraq; Schweich Lecturer, British Academy, etc. Author: "Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets," "Early History of Assyria," "Alalakh and Chronology," etc.

GEORGE F. HELLICK, president of the George F. Hellick Coffee Co. since 1906; owns and operates two family farms, and has studied agricultural problems in North Africa, Europe, the Matanuska Colony and elsewhere in Alaska, and in every state of the

United States. He has served two terms as trustee of Pennsylvania State College, ten years as a director of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, and as state and national counsellor of the Easton, Pa., Board of Trade. In early life he worked in a grist mill, a creamery, a distillery and on the farm, and was an apprentice in a wheelwright's shop.

NEIL, MACNEIL, A.B. (U. of St. Francis Xavier, N.S., '12), assistant managing editor, *The New York Times*. Author: "Without Fear or Favor," "An American Peace," etc.

DONALD A. MACLEAN, S.T.L., PH.D. (Catholic U.), (McGill, Harvard, Canadian Royal, Geneva School of Int'l. Studies, post-grad.), associate professor of social and international ethics, Catholic University of America, Washington. Priest of the Roman Catholic diocese of British Columbia; created domestic prelate with style of Right Rev. Msgr. by Pope Pius XII. Member, Académie Diplomatique Internationale. Author: "Christian Industrial Democracy," "A Dynamic World Order," "Permanent Peace Program of Pope Benedict XV," etc.; contributor, *The Catholic Historical Review*, *The International Journal of Ethics*, etc.

T. SWANN HARDING, B.S.CHEM. (Maryland), senior information specialist, United States Department of Agriculture. Formerly, research chemist, U.S.D.A., 1910, and later scientific editor of the department's technical publications. Author: "The Popular Practice of Fraud," etc.

ASHLEY MITCHELL is chairman of the Liberal Liberty League and treasurer of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values. He has been a Liberal party candidate for Parliament several times.

JOHN HERVEY, essayist and poet of Chicago, is the author of the racing classic, "Racing in America."

PHYLLIS EVANS, M.A. (Chicago, '35), literary secretary to Francis Neilson since 1934; member, editorial advisory board, AM. JOUR. ECON. SOCIO.